

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/21**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers intentionally and improperly discharged a firearm, on or off-duty, in the performance of law enforcement duties.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An officer-involved shooting occurred inside a residential hotel. Before the shooting occurred, the involved officers were investigating reports of a subject with a knife attacking hotel employees and making death threats. An officer fatally shot the subject when he suddenly raised a knife above his head and charged down an enclosed hallway toward the officers. The DPA investigated the incident because San Francisco Administrative Code §96.11 mandates that the DPA investigate any incident in which the discharge of a firearm by a San Francisco Police Department officer causes injury or death. The DPA's investigation included: interviews of involved parties and witnesses; examination of documents and audio recordings from the San Francisco Police Department, the Department of Emergency Management, and the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner; and review of surveillance and body-worn camera footage.

On the afternoon of the incident, the subject's case worker called 911 to request police assistance at a residential hotel that provides supportive and transitional housing to justice-involved adults. The case worker reported that her client was running around the hotel with a "knife in his hand" and screaming. She communicated that her client held a knife to her face and then retreated to his room.

The two named officers were assigned to investigate a "person with a knife" incident. Dispatch advised the officers by radio that there was "a male inside the building with a knife" and that the suspect had held a knife to the reporting party's face. The suspect was of either Latin or Middle Eastern descent and he had retreated to his room. One officer was familiar with the hotel from taking several prior missing persons incident reports. The officers decided to bring an extended range impact weapon (ERIW), which is a firearm loaded with beanbag ammunition. Extended range impact weapons are designed to temporarily incapacitate aggressive subjects who pose an imminent threat of serious injury to an officer or another person.

When the officers arrived, they rang a doorbell and were remotely buzzed in through a secure gate by hotel staff. One officer took the lead in communicating with the reporting parties. He immediately walked up the entryway staircase to locate the case worker who had called 911. The lead officer's partner stayed behind briefly to secure the front gate in anticipation of backup officers arriving. The partner officer was carrying a red and black ERIW.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/21**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 6**

The lead officer met the case worker and a desk clerk in a hallway near the front reception desk. His partner joined a few moments later. A large screen in the office showed security footage from around the hotel.

The lead officer stood in the office doorway and interviewed the desk clerk and case worker about what was happening. The desk clerk said that the suspect “came at [him]” with a large kitchen knife and threatened, “I will stab you right now. I’ll kill you.” The desk clerk demonstrated the suspect’s actions for the officers. He pretended to hold a knife and reenacted a lunging motion at waist-level and a raised fist attack. Surveillance video would later show that, before the officers arrived, the suspect had aggressively confronted the desk clerk with a knife. The desk clerk had protected himself by holding the bristled end of a broom in front of his body as a makeshift barrier. The desk clerk was fearful and believed that the suspect intended to follow through on his threats of violence. He asked the officers to remove the suspect from the premises.

The case worker informed the officers of the suspect’s name and nickname, his room number, his history of violent behavior, and that he still had the knife. The case worker checked the security cameras and confirmed that the suspect had returned to his room.

As the officers were interviewing the case manager and desk clerk, a second case worker called 911 from an offsite location. She reported that one of her clients at the hotel was armed with a knife and likely experiencing a “psychotic” post-traumatic stress episode. This information was broadcast to backup officers through the computer aided dispatch system but was not broadcast over the radio to the officers at the scene.

The lead officer reported to Dispatch that they could hear the suspect screaming. He requested an ambulance, a tactical shield, and that backup officers be sent to the scene.

Two doors in the hallway leading to the suspect’s room were ajar. The lead officer walked halfway down the hall to confirm that the rooms were empty. The suspect then appeared at the end of the hallway. The suspect’s head and the left side of his body were visible. The right side of the suspect’s body remained around the hallway corner and were visually obscured. The suspect’s left hand appeared empty but neither officer could see if he was holding a weapon in his right hand.

The lead officer asked the suspect his name and said he just wanted to talk. The suspect yelled at the officers to leave him alone and then retreated around the corner. Aware that the suspect was likely armed with a knife, the officers discussed the situation and made a tactical decision to maintain a safe distance until backup arrived.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/21**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25**

**PAGE# 3 of 6**

The officers walked back to the reception office to confirm the suspect's identity. The suspect continued yelling from around the corner. Again, the officers called out to him and said that they just wanted to talk. The suspect shouted, "don't disturb me" and "leave me alone." The suspect yelled for about a minute and then retreated to his room. A door slammed in the distance and the suspect was momentarily quiet.

The lead officer positioned himself partially inside one of the empty rooms. His partner stood to his left. The lead officer radioed again to request an ambulance and to check the status of backup units, including the unit bringing the tactical shield.

Later, when the officers were questioned about their tactical decisions, the officers explained that they were attempting to establish a rapport and to create "time and distance." These are two techniques used for diffusing tension with suspects in crisis. They noted that the suspect was alone, contained in his room, and not posing an immediate danger to others. Their goal was to wait for backup officers to arrive with a shield, which could provide better conditions for using an ERIW.

As the officers waited for radio responses, the suspect emerged from his bedroom and ran toward the hallway, where the officers were waiting. The suspect rounded the corner and momentarily paused. He quickly shifted his weight back and forth. His stance was wide, and he was gripping a large knife in his right hand at waist level. The knife blade was pointing toward the officers. Both officers raised their firearms to the ready position. The lead officer shouted, "Stay back!" several times. The suspect shouted in another language and charged at the officers.

Both officers moved backward with their firearms raised. The suspect did not slow down. The suspect quickly gained momentum, swinging the knife back and forth as he ran. The partner officer fired three beanbag ammunition rounds from his ERIW. Both officers observed at least one beanbag round contact the suspect in the torso area, with no apparent impact on his movements. The officers continued shouting for the suspect to stop. The officers later explained that they made a tactical decision not to retreat past the reception office for the protection of the reporting parties.

In less than five seconds, the suspect was within ten to fifteen feet of the officers and still charging forward. The lead officer fired one round from his handgun. The suspect fell to the ground in front of the open doorway where the officers had originally positioned themselves to wait for backup. The suspect briefly sat up and then pulled himself halfway into a vacant room. At that time, the suspect's entire torso was obscured from the officers' view.

The officers ordered the suspect to show his hands so that they could provide medical aid. The suspect continued shouting and moving his lower body and did not show his hands. The knife was by his side and still within reaching distance. The officers could not tell if the suspect was wounded or if he had any other weapons. Within a few minutes, backup officers arrived with a shield. Using the shield as protection,

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/21**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 6**

backup officers approached the suspect, confiscated the knife lying nearby on the floor, and began administering first aid.

In an interview, the partner officer later explained that he fired his ERIW to defend himself, his partner, and other people in the area. He fired three beanbag rounds before the fourth round jammed. The partner officer said that the suspect closed the distance between them within a matter of seconds. He evaluated his force options after seeing that the beanbag rounds had no perceptible effect. He had no time to pull out an alternate weapon and feared that the suspect would stab him.

In an interview, the lead officer later explained that he was the “lethal cover” officer for his partner. His partner was using an ERIW, which is considered an alternative to lethal force but which offers less protection for officers. The lead officer used verbal commands and waited for his partner to try the ERIW, which had no apparent effect. The suspect continued charging at them with a knife. In defense of himself, his partner, and others in the area, the lead officer fired one shot from his handgun. The lead officer explained that no other force options were feasible at the time because of the immediate “life threat” posed by the suspect’s actions.

Further investigation would later reveal that the suspect had a history of violence against law enforcement officers.

San Francisco Police Department General Order in effect at the time of the incident, 5.01 – Use of Force, stated:

The San Francisco Police Department’s highest priority is safeguarding the life, dignity and liberty of all persons.

...

Officers may use reasonable force options in the performance of their duties, in the following circumstances:

4. In defense of others or in self-defense.

The order describes levels of resistance, and defines “life-threatening” resistance as, “Any action likely to result in serious bodily injury or death of the officer or another person.”

It describes levels of force, and states:

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/21**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25**

**PAGE# 5 of 6**

It is the policy of this Department to use deadly force only as a last resort when reasonable alternatives have been exhausted or are not feasible to protect the safety of the public and police officers.

...an officer may discharge a firearm or use other deadly force ... In self-defense when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that he or she is in immediate danger of death or serious bodily injury; or ... In defense of another person when the officer has reasonable cause to believe that the person is in immediate danger of death or serious bodily injury.

It lists factors for evaluating the use of force, including:

Whether the suspect posed an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others ... Whether the use of force is proportional to the threat ... The availability of other feasible, less intrusive force options ... The officer's tactical conduct and decisions preceding the use of force ... Whether the subject's escape could pose a future safety risk.

The order also describes de-escalation, and states:

When encountering a non-compliant subject or a subject armed with a weapon other than a firearm, officers shall when feasible, use the following de-escalation tactics in an effort to reduce the need or degree of force:

1. Attempt to isolate and contain the subject;
2. Create time and distance from the subject by establishing a buffer zone (reactionary gap) and utilize cover to avoid creating an immediate threat that may require the use of force;
3. Request additional resources, such as Crisis Intervention Team (CIT) trained officers, Crisis/Hostage Negotiation Team, or Extended Range Impact Weapon;
4. Designate an officer to establish rapport and engage in communication with the subject;
5. Tactically re-position as often as necessary to maintain the reactionary gap, protect the public, and preserve officer safety; and
6. Continue de-escalation techniques and take as much time as reasonably necessary to resolve the incident, without having to use force, if feasible.

In this case, the officers' use-of-force complied with San Francisco Police Department guidelines. The officers appropriately evaluated their force options at each stage of the incident and reasonably used lethal force to protect themselves from the suspect's life-threatening resistance.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/19/21**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25**

**PAGE# 6 of 6**

Before using force, the officers had information about the suspect holding a knife to someone's throat and threatening to kill two hotel employees with a knife. The suspect was self-isolating and contained in his room when the officers first arrived. The officers could hear the suspect shouting in the background and requested backup.

The suspect then came out of his room and stood at the end of the hallway. The officers attempted to establish a rapport with the suspect by asking his name and saying that they wanted to talk. The suspect shouted for them to leave and retreated to his room. The officers discussed a de-escalation plan. They decided to maintain their distance and wait for additional resources. They were prepared with an ERIW, which is considered a lower level of force than a traditional handgun. This was an appropriate choice given that the suspect was armed with a knife but maintaining his distance.

Before backup could arrive, the suspect charged at the officers with a knife in his hand. The partner officer attempted to subdue the suspect with an ERIW. Both officers observed that the ERIW was ineffective. When the suspect was within ten feet of both officers, the lead officer fired a single shot.

Video footage showed that it took approximately three to four seconds for the suspect to run from the end of the hallway to the open doorway where the officers had originally positioned themselves. In the few seconds it took for the suspect to reach the officers, there was no reasonable time for the officers to deescalate or reposition themselves a second time to create a larger buffer zone. The officers were in a confined area and trying to protect themselves and the reporting parties.

The subject was using a deadly weapon and engaged in life-threatening action that was likely to cause serious injury or death. The threat was immediate because the suspect was running directly at both officers with a knife in his hand. His words and actions showed a present intent to injure the officers. The partner officer was justified in using his ERIW and the lead officer was justified in using lethal force to protect himself and his partner from being attacked with a knife.

The evidence proved that the officers' conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 11**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1:** The officers detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer detained him by blocking his path with his police vehicle and swerving onto the sidewalk. The officer got out of the car, approached him aggressively, and said something to him, but he could not hear what the officer was saying because he had his headphones on. When he removed his headphones, the officer was shouting at him and pushed him up against the wall, saying something about how he thought he could get away. The officer told him to get on the ground, tackled him to the ground, and handcuffed him. The officer was adamant that the complainant was the one he sought. The officer said, "Get on the ground now!" while tackling him. It was just him and the detaining officer at this point. He was face down on his stomach when he went to the ground and was handcuffed, and other officers arrived at the scene.

The named officer stated he detained the complainant because the complainant matched the description of a felony suspect who eluded pursuit by plainclothes officers following a high-speed vehicle chase and crash. Multiple officers from two nearby police stations responded to assist in locating the suspect. The named officer, the Acting Lieutenant from a nearby station, responded to the scene. As he drove to the area, he heard another Lieutenant state over the radio that he needed a subject detained who was walking northbound on a nearby street. That Lieutenant was in plain clothes, walking directly behind the subject, putting out his location, and directing officers to him. The named officer stated he pulled his marked patrol vehicle onto the sidewalk about 40-60 feet in front of the subject, exited his vehicle, and detained the subject.

Witness Officer #1 stated he was the Event Commander of a plainclothes auto burglary/robbery abatement operation. Officers assigned to the operation deployed a tire deflation device on a vehicle involved in auto burglaries, and the occupants abandoned the disabled vehicle and fled on foot. He responded to the area to help coordinate the search for the suspects. Witness Officer #1 heard an officer broadcast that a possible suspect was walking north on a nearby street. Witness Officer #1 moved to that area, got out on foot, and saw only a single person matching the description walking north on the sidewalk. Witness Officer #1 began following the person on foot from a safe distance behind and asked the describing officer if the subject was the person he thought should be detained. The officer confirmed the complainant was the person he had described.

Witness Officer #2 stated he was participating in an auto burglary and robbery operation. A vehicle and its occupants had committed numerous auto burglaries in the area. The car was eventually abandoned, and three males exited and fled into a park. He had seen two of the suspects, both black males. One male

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25 PAGE# 2 of 11**

was wearing all-black clothing. The other male was wearing all-white clothing. He did not see the third suspect, the driver, but a sergeant involved in the incident described him as a black male wearing all-black clothing. Two of the suspects were detained, but the third suspect eluded officers. Witness Officer #2 stated he and another officer were in the area and saw numerous discarded articles of clothing. An officer informed him that he saw a person, who was later identified as the complainant, behind a building wearing all-black clothing and appeared to be sweating.

Witness Officer #2 broadcast his observations regarding the suspect's location and requested additional units to assist in detaining the suspect. Witness Officer #2 stated he observed the named officer exit a marked police vehicle in full uniform and approached the complainant to detain him. Witness Officer #2 said the complainant was in the area of the direction of flight of the outstanding suspect, his clothing was similar to the clothing of the outstanding suspect, and he appeared to be sweating. It was later determined that the complainant was not involved in the incident when another sergeant involved in the pursuit came to the scene and confirmed the complainant was not the suspect.

Witness Officer #3 stated that the complainant was initially detained because he matched the description of auto burglary suspects who fled from police at a high rate of speed in a vehicle that later crashed, and all suspects fled on foot. It was later determined that the complainant was not involved in the crime after a sergeant involved in the pursuit came to the scene and said the complainant was not the suspect he observed fleeing the scene. He issued the complainant a Certificate of Release following his detention.

Witness Officer #4 stated he was working in a plainclothes capacity. During the operation, three suspects of an auto burglary crew, described as one black male wearing all white clothing and two black males wearing all black clothing, fled from officers in a vehicle and collided with a concrete divider. All suspects fled from the scene. Units advised that two suspects were taken into custody, and one was still outstanding. He and Witness Officer #2 responded to the area to search for the outstanding suspect. Upon arrival, he observed a black male, later identified as the complainant, wearing all-black clothing on the northwest corner of the lodge. This was the area one of the plainclothes sergeants described where he observed the two suspects in black clothing flee on foot. Because numerous officers were on the scene creating a perimeter, and based on his training and experience, he knows suspects may double back when they see officers block off paths of escape. Based on the suspect's description, location, and the time frame of the incident matched the complainant's description and location, he believed that the complainant was the outstanding suspect. The complainant was in the immediate area of a rapidly unfolding incident. He was searching the area for a fleeing suspect described as a black male, wearing all-black clothing, in the area of a lodge. The complainant appeared to be a black male wearing all-black clothing and was in a lodge area.

Witness Officer #5 stated he was a sergeant participating in a robbery/burglary abatement operation with numerous members of the city-wide plain clothes teams. They attempted to apprehend several vehicle occupants who had previously committed vehicle burglaries in San Francisco. At some point in the



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 3 of 11**

apprehension efforts, the vehicle collided with a cement divider. Three occupants exited the car and began running away from it. He was the first person behind the vehicle and observed all three occupants exit. Two black males, both initially wearing all black, ran together in the direction of the Park Ranger Station, while a third black male who was wearing white clothing ran eastbound along a street towards another street. He chased after the two males while broadcasting his observations on the radio. He was able to take into custody one of the males, while the other (wearing a white shirt now) was momentarily lost. Once the scene stabilized, he saw the male in all white being detained and knew they were still looking for the last suspect. He was made aware that a possible suspect was stopped on a nearby street. When he arrived and saw the person detained, he determined it was not the third suspect as he was too tall. The person was subsequently released from the scene, and they ultimately located the third suspect hiding in the bushes in the nearby area. The clothing description and the travel pattern of the complainant were very likely probabilities for the third suspect; thus, it provided reasonable suspicion for that detention.

Department records, including the Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD), the Incident Report (IR), and photographs taken at the scene, corroborated the named officer's account of the incident.

Body-worn camera (BWC) evidence from the encounter corroborated the officers' reported purpose for detaining the complainant.

Department General Order 5.03 allows a police officer to briefly detain a person for questioning or request identification only if the officer has reasonable suspicion that the person's behavior is related to criminal activity. Reasonable suspicion is a set of specific facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime is, was, or is about to occur and that the person under suspicion is reasonably connected to the crime. Reasonable suspicion to detain is also established whenever there is any violation of law. Reasonable suspicion cannot be based solely on a hunch or instinct.

Based on the information provided to the named officer by other officers involved in a rapidly unfolding felony incident, there was probable cause for the named officer to detain the complainant for further investigation. The complainant matched the physical and clothing description broadcasted by officers in the field and was in the area where the incident occurred. The named officer lawfully detained the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 4 of 11**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer shoved him against the wall and tackled him. The complainant said the named officer shoved his head to the floor with his knee on the complainant's back. The complainant said he twisted his right foot when the officer tackled him. The complainant said he had not sought any medical attention for his injury.

The named officer stated he exited his patrol vehicle and believed the complainant was attempting to run/flee but saw that vehicle traffic was too heavy, so he ordered the complainant down to the ground and handcuffed him there. He took control of the complainant's left arm as he was compliantly going to the ground as he had ordered him to. The named officer stated he did not believe he ever touched the complainant's head or intentionally placed his knee on his back. His only concern was to contain the complainant and detain him least forcefully and safely. As the complainant lowered himself to the ground, he lost sight of his arm/hand and reiterated his command to get down, stating something to the effect of "Down means down." The only reason he did that was because he lost sight of his hand and wanted him to move it away from his body so that he didn't potentially arm himself. The named officer noted that during his contact with the complainant and other officers' contact with the complainant, the complainant appeared to be in good spirits and never complained of pain or injury. The complainant was, for the most part, compliant in his behavior. He ordered the complainant to the ground, and he was lowering himself (going down to one knee) when he moved towards the complainant. The named officer grabbed his left arm, guided him to the ground, and then handcuffed him with the assistance of another officer.

The named officer stated he is familiar with the types of force that are reportable. In this instance, his actions were not a reportable use of force. The minimal interaction that he had with the complainant was Type 1 force. The complainant did not complain of any pain or injury on the scene during the interaction.

Witness Officer #1 stated he saw the named officer drive his car onto the sidewalk. He saw the complainant walking on the sidewalk and then moved to his left toward the curblineline. He heard the named officer shout something to the complainant and saw the named officer take the complainant to the ground while gripping his arm and then handcuff him. Witness Officer #1 was unaware of any complaint of pain or injury made by the complainant. Witness Officer #1 believed the named officer's actions were classified as Low-Level Force, Type I, based on the version of the DGO in effect at the time.

Witness Officer #2 stated he observed the named officer exit a marked police vehicle in full uniform and approach the complainant. He saw the complainant attempt to move around the named officer, but then the two were on the ground. Witness Officer #2 stated his view was obstructed, so he was not sure what force, if any, was used. Witness Officer #2 said the complainant was asked if he was injured, and he said he was not. The complainant did not complain of pain or injury.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 5 of 11**

Witness Officer #3 stated he did not observe the detention and interaction between the complainant and the named officer. The complainant did not complain of any pain or injury when he spoke to the complainant and issued the complainant a Certificate of Release form.

Witness Officer #4 stated he did not see the interaction between the complainant and the named officer and arrived on the scene afterward. Once on the scene, he did not hear the complainant make any claims of injury or pain.

Witness Officer #5 stated he was absent when the named officer interacted with the complainant. Once on scene, he did not hear the complainant complain of any injury or pain.

Witness Officer #6, the named officer's supervisor, stated he was not present nor involved in the incident. Still, he directed the named officer to complete a supplemental report regarding his involvement and use of force, if applicable, at the request of Witness Officer #1. His purpose in doing so was to ensure that Witness Officer #1's request was carried out and that any involvement or use of force by the named officer, if applicable, was properly documented.

Witness Officer #7 stated when he arrived on the scene, the named officer had already had a subject on the ground and had detained him. The subject was lying on his stomach, and the named officer had control of the subject's left hand. Witness Officer #7 grabbed the subject's right hand and held it behind his back, assisting the named officer in safely handcuffing the subject. He did not see the named officer shove the subject's head to the ground or put his knee on his back. As he got closer, he observed that the named officer had both knees on the ground and not on the subject's back. He did not see any use of force on the subject. The subject did not tell him he had any complaints of pain or injury.

The Supplemental IR was recorded as not a use-of-force incident. Therefore, no use-of-force logs or Supervisor Use-of-Force Review Forms were completed regarding the interaction between the named officer and the complainant.

Department records, including, but not limited to the Initial Incident Report, Supplemental Report, CAD, BWC, and evidence photos, were reviewed. The named officer documented the interaction in a Supplemental Incident Report.

The body-worn camera (BWC) evidence corroborated the named officer's account of the interaction.

Department General Order (DGO) 5.01, revised 12/28/23, Section 5.01.03(B), states that officers should use the minimum amount of force necessary. DGO 5.01.04(A)(1) and (2) state that an officer may use reasonable force to effect a lawful arrest, detention, or search, as well as to overcome resistance or to prevent escape.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 6 of 11**

Department General Order (DGO) (Use of Force), 5.01.03(E) states, "All uses of force are reportable except for Type I force. Types II, III, and IV force are reportable."

DGO 5.01.05(A) defines "compliant" as "Subject offers no resistance."

DGO 5.01.05(B) defines "passive non-compliance" as "Does not respond to verbal commands but also offers no physical form of resistance." Possible force options for passive non-compliance are "Officer's strength to take physical control, including lifting/carrying," or "Pain compliance control holds, takedowns and techniques to direct movement or immobilize."

DGO 5.01.05(C) defines "active resistance" as "Physically evasive movements to defeat an officer's attempt at control including bracing, tensing, running away, verbally or physically signaling an intention to avoid or prevent being taken into or retained in custody." Possible force options for active resistance are the "Use of personal body weapons to gain an advantage over the subject" or "Pain compliance control holds, takedowns, and techniques to direct movement or immobilize a subject."

DGO 5.01.07 describes "Type I Non-reportable" force as, "Type I force occurs when an officer's physical interaction with a subject (1) is reasonably unlikely to cause pain or injury; or (2) does not cause pain or injury; or (3) the subject does not report pain or injury." Applicable techniques include "The use of hands or equipment to stop, move, direct, or otherwise exercise control of a person or situation" or "Non-injurious physical control holds to gain compliance that are not reasonably likely to cause pain." Examples include "Officers hold the wrist of a subject in crisis in place while paramedics secure the subject in a 4-point restraint," "Officers nudge past people, in order to wedge through a crowd," "Two officers separate two agitated, arguing subjects, grabbing each subject above the elbow and guiding him away from the other combatant," or "During handcuffing, a suspect turns his torso as the officer makes physical contact. The officer grips the wrists of the subject firmly to prevent further movement by the subject."

DGO 5.01.07 describes "Type II force," in part, as "Force that (1) is reasonably likely to cause pain or injury; or (2) causes transitory physical pain or injury; or (3) the subject reports physical pain or injury." Applicable techniques include "Arrest or Control pain compliance techniques" or "Type I physical interaction that results in pain or injury (observed or reported)." Examples include, "An officer uses a takedown technique to gain control of an actively resisting subject." DGO 5.01.09 requires officers to document reportable use of force in their incident report in very specific ways.

The SFPD Arrest and Control Manual defines a control hold as "[a] method to physically controlling a suspect by manually applying pressure until the peace officer has control over the suspect." The Manual provides examples of control holds, all of which are applied to a standing subject. The Manual defines a takedown as "A method for breaking the suspect's balance and bringing the suspect to the ground so control can be established."

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 7 of 11**

The evidence shows that the named officer used Type I force to detain and handcuff the complainant. A preponderance of the evidence established that the named officer's actions complied with department policy.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers applied handcuffs without justification.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said he was handcuffed without justification.

Named Officer #1 stated he handcuffed the complainant because he believed that the complainant already was involved in felonious behavior involving multiple auto burglaries where the vehicle and suspects had evaded plainclothes officers in a high-speed chase and crash. The named officer was aware that people involved in auto burglaries had been armed in the past. He wanted to contain the complainant, who he was led to believe was a suspect in the aforementioned crimes, in the least dangerous way to himself, the complainant, and potentially the public.

Named Officer #2 stated that when he arrived on the scene, the named officer already had the subject on the ground and had detained him. The subject was lying on his stomach, and Officer #1 had control of the subject's left hand. He grabbed the subject's right hand and held it behind his back to assist Named Officer #1 in safely handcuffing the subject.

BWC footage from the encounter corroborated the officers' reported purpose for handcuffing the complainant,

The SFPD Arrest and Control Manual Handcuffing Guidelines states: Who should be handcuffed:

- When the subject is being arrested for a felony offense
- When the subject is a violent misdemeanor or a misdemeanor who exhibits a tendency to escape.
- Nothing in the above shall preclude the use of handcuffs on any prisoner when their use is deemed necessary by the arresting officer.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 8 of 11**

The named officers' handcuffing of the complainant while they conducted an investigative detention was justified under the circumstances.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he believed the named officer racially profiled him and stopped him only because he is black.

The named officer stated he was directed to the subject based on information broadcast over the radio by a lieutenant following the subject and directly behind him. The information included the subject's sex, race, dress, location, and direction of flight. He did not discriminate against the complainant based on race. The plainclothes officers in charge of the investigation explained the detention to the complainant at the scene.

The Body-Worn Camera (BWC) evidence showed no indications of bias by the named officer.

The reason for detaining the complainant is documented in the incident report. The complainant matched the suspect's description based on information provided by officers involved in the pursuit of the suspect. This detention was an unfortunate result of several suspects, who happened to be of the same race as the complainant, attempting to evade capture in the same area that the complainant happened to be transiting at the same time.

A preponderance of the evidence proved that the act alleged in the complaint did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 9 of 11**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #6:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer went and sat in his patrol car and did not apologize to the complainant after the complainant was released. The named officer showed "zero remorse or professionalism."

The named officer described his demeanor toward the complainant as professional. He stated he believed he was out of his patrol vehicle and that the complainant's interpretation was not accurate. He was not in charge of the investigation. The investigating officers explained the nature of the detention to the complainant and apologized to him.

Witness Officer #3 stated he issued the complainant a Certificate of Release per Department policy. The complainant was initially detained by the named officer as he matched the description of one of the auto burglary suspects who fled from police at a high rate of speed in a vehicle that later crashed. All three suspects fled on foot. It was later determined that the complainant was not involved in the crime when the officer involved in the pursuit came to the scene and confirmed the complainant was not the suspect he had pursued.

The BWC footage corroborates the named officer's account. The BWC shows the named officer briefly walking over to his patrol vehicle, then back to Witness Officer #2 for a moment, walking back to his patrol vehicle, and standing next to one of the sergeants on the scene. Once the complainant is released by Witness Officer #3 the complainant can be heard telling the plainclothes officer, "It's fine, it's fine." Witness Officer #3 apologizes to the complainant. The named officer eventually gets in his car and leaves. The named officer did not have further contact with the complainant.

Department General Order 2.01 General Rules of Conduct, 2.01.03, 8 states that when performing their duties, members shall "Treat the public with courtesy and respect and not direct discourteous or profane language at members of the public."

The plainclothes officers were in charge of the investigation and took control of the scene, which was appropriate based on the facts and how the incident unfolded. The named officer did not behave or speak inappropriately to the complainant. The named officer was not responsible for conducting the investigation, and the officer acted professionally.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 10 of 11**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION 7:** The officer conducted an improper search or seizure.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the officer searched him.

The named officer stated he conducted a cursory pat search for weapons. The complainant was detained because he matched the description and clothing of a felony auto burglary suspect who eluded pursuit by plainclothes officers following a high-speed vehicle chase and crash. He searched the complainant for anything that could have been used as a weapon. He did not locate any weapons during the search.

The body-worn camera (BWC) footage corroborates the officer's actions.

DGO 5.03 states that a pat search is allowed only if a reasonably prudent officer would be warranted in the belief that the officer's safety or that of others was in danger.

Given the seriousness of the incident's rapidly unfolding events, it was reasonable for the named officer to conduct a cursory pat search of the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #8:** The officer misrepresented the truth.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officer claimed in the presence of other officers that the complainant "tried to run from him." The complainant said this was a "bold face lie."

The named officer stated that he believed the complainant contemplated running based on the complainant's body movements and his 28 years of experience as an officer.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/22/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 11 of 11**

Witness Officer #1 stated he was following the complainant and saw the complainant move to his left toward the curb line when the named officer drove his patrol car up onto the sidewalk.

Witness Officer #2 stated he observed the named officer, who was in full uniform and exiting a marked police vehicle, approaching the complainant. He saw the complainant attempt to move around the officer. The officer then detained the complainant. Witness Officer #2 stated he did not have a completely clear view of the detention as he was across the street, and numerous vehicles were between them.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage corroborated the named officer's account. A plainclothes lieutenant is following the complainant on foot. The complainant is observed to be walking northbound on the sidewalk. As the complainant approaches a construction scaffold on a building on his right side and a construction barricade on his left side, the complainant moves to the left as if he is going to go into the street but then walks around the construction barricade and veers right on the sidewalk.

Based on the complainant's movements, it was not unreasonable for the named officer to believe that the complainant was contemplating trying to run from him and avoid being detained. However, the officer's conduct did not rise to a level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/25/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to Mirandize.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** ND

**FINDING:** PC

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported being arrested for his involvement in a fight and assault. He was upset that the officers did not advise him of his *Miranda* rights during this incident.

The officer reported that the complainant had used racist and derogatory slurs toward officers at the scene. Due to his aggressive and resistive behavior, the officers could not *Mirandize* or communicate with him.

The body-worn camera footage shows the complainant was not *Mirandized*.

Department records showed the officer came on scene to an active physical altercation between the complainant and a security guard and both disregarded officers command to stop until the officer deployed OC spray to separate the two subjects.

The law requires officers to *Mirandize* a person in custody before custodial interrogation occurs. Here, the complainant was arrested for mayhem and although he was in custody, the officers did not interrogate him. Therefore, a *Miranda* advisement was not required.

The evidence proves the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to properly process property.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** ND

**FINDING:** PC

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that a named officer removed his wedding ring and failed to give him a property receipt. He believed the officer kept his ring. The officer confirmed he took the complainant's wedding ring and did not issue the complainant a property receipt; however, he denied keeping the ring. The officer explained that he took the ring at the hospital and did not issue him a

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/25/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 2 of 4**

property receipt because the ring was sent with the complainant to San Francisco County Jail and was handed over to a Sheriff's deputy.

The Department of Police Accountability requested the property record and receipt from the San Francisco Sheriff's Office (SFSO). The records showed that the SFSO had booked the complainant's property, including his ring. Additionally, the records showed the complainant's signature on the forms confirming that the SFSO had released the ring to the complainant upon his release from custody.

Department General Order 5.09 describes officers' duties and responsibilities when transporting and admitting an arrestee at San Francisco General Hospital, in absentia, into the San Francisco County Jail. An officer transporting an arrestee to San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) is responsible for the arrestee until that arrestee is:

1. Booked into a District Station or the County Jail, or,
2. When all of the following conditions have taken place:
  - a. The arrestee is admitted by the "physician-in-charge".
  - b. A Field Arrest Card is completed (prisoner housing card) and any relevant prisoner property (including clothing and money) are delivered to County Jail #9.
  - c. The arrestee is booked at the SFGH Jail Ward and the officer is formally relieved by a deputy sheriff.

The DPA's investigation found that the officer did not process the complainant's property at the station because the complainant was taken to the hospital; therefore, the officer was not required to issue a property receipt under Department General Order 6.15, SFPD's property processing policy. The officer's conduct was in compliance with department policy.

The evidence proves that the officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-5:** The officers failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/25/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 3 of 4**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officers did not allow him to use the restroom as a form of retaliation when they arrived at the San Francisco County Jail. He alleged he waited a long time in the transport wagon and ultimately urinated and defecated on himself.

The officers denied retaliating against the complainant by refusing him access to a restroom. They stated that they had requested permission from the SFSO deputies for the complainant to enter the premises to use the bathroom, but that request was denied. The deputies instructed them to direct the complainant to a Porta-Potty located in the parking lot. Due to the complainant's verbally and physically aggressive behavior, the officers felt unsafe uncuffing him to allow him to use the porta-potty in an unsecured area. Concerned about officer safety, the complainant ended up relieving himself in the back of the SFPD wagon.

Body-worn camera footage was unavailable for this part of the incident, as officers are not permitted to activate their cameras while at the San Francisco County Jail.

Department records indicated that an officer documented the jail was busy when the complainant was brought in for booking and not allowed inside to use the restroom. Due to the complainant's assaultive behavior, it was not feasible for the complainant to be uncuffed to use the Porta-Potty in a semi-unsecured sally port. The complainant removed his pants and shoes and defecated in the back of the patrol wagon.

There was insufficient evidence to either prove or disprove if officers retaliated against the complainant by delaying or denying the complainant the access to the bathroom, resulting in the complainant defecating on himself.

Therefore, DPA concluded that the evidence was insufficient to prove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #6-8:** The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported the officers laughed at him when he urinated and defecated on himself.

All involved officers denied laughing at the complainant.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 04/25/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 4 of 4**

Body-worn camera footage was unavailable for this part of the incident, as officers are not permitted to activate their cameras while at the San Francisco County Jail.

The evidence was insufficient evidence to prove that officers laughed at the complainant after he defecated in the wagon.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/04/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she went to her ex-partner's residence to retrieve her property. A dispute ensued between the two and the police were called. The named officer and his partner responded to the scene. The complainant stated that the named officer failed to properly investigate the incident as among other things, they unfairly sided with the partner and did not review available evidence.

The named officer stated that when he arrived on-scene, his objective was to separate both parties as they were standing in close proximity. He wanted to take independent statements and to prevent anyone from talking over each other. He realized that the incident potentially involved domestic violence and investigated accordingly. During his investigation, he realized that the incident, in large part, concerned the complainant wanting her property back from the ex-partner. He ultimately believed the incident to be civil in nature but decided to conduct a civil standby to help the complainant retrieve her property and de-escalate the matter. The named officer stated that he was unable to determine whether a crime had occurred based on the statements provided and that additional evidence, such as witnesses and surveillance footage, was not available.

Throughout the investigation, the complainant informed the officer of an incident that occurred the day prior where she attempted to remove her belongings, and the ex-partner “forcibly” took her items to prevent her from leaving. The named officer stated that he believed the complainant to be complaining about being unable to retrieve her property the day prior. He confirmed that she told him that there were cameras in the elevators that may have captured said incident. However, he stated that the footage would not have been able to show ownership of her property which he believed to be the main issue. Additionally, the named officer stated that there was no clear allegation that the partner imprisoned her the day prior or that she was not free to leave, warranting a criminal investigation. He emphasized that he believed the situation to be about two bags that she wanted to retrieve, which he repeatedly stated he helped her to do. The named officer denied siding with the partner and ignoring the complainant. He stated that he tried to address her concerns but that she was non-compliant with him and continuously spoke over him, making it difficult. The named officer believed he conducted the investigation properly.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/04/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025      PAGE# 2 of 6**

DPA obtained the named officer's body-worn camera footage (BWC). The body-worn camera footage showed the named officer spoke to both parties at length and tried to resolve the current issue at hand, the retrieval of the complainant's property. To the extent that the named officer thought one of the parties was alleging domestic violence, the footage showed him being extremely clear that if that were the case, he would need to investigate it, and someone would likely be going to jail. The footage showed the named officer spoke to both parties separately about the allegations from the day that they responded. What is less clear, however, is whether the named officer perceived the complainant to be complaining of a crime the day prior. The footage showed the complainant, at one point, stating she was assaulted. However, it is not apparent whether the named officer understood whether she was referring to the day prior or the incident at hand, which he fully investigated. Additionally, the footage captured the complainant making inconsistent statements about her objective in the incident and in large part confirming that she just wanted to retrieve her property and nothing more.

While, ideally, an officer should slow down and take time to clarify any confusion, this complainant was highly upset and made inconsistent statements about what she wished to have happen. The named officer fully and properly investigated the incident that occurred on the date they responded. However, the named officer's potential inaction from failing to investigate the incident from the day prior near the elevator did not rise to the level of misconduct in these circumstances.

It was clear, in hindsight, that the complainant alleged domestic violence the day prior. In the heat of what was going on, DPA finds no misconduct that the officer did not pull the elevator videos as he explained he believed the day before to also be related to a property dispute and that the footage would not have been relevant.

Due to the confusion and lack of clarity, DPA finds that there is insufficient evidence to determine whether the officer failed to properly investigate the earlier incident.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/04/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025      PAGE# 3 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant specifically mentioned that both officers failed to properly investigate.

This named officer stated that he responded to the scene as back-up and did not investigate while on-scene.

DPA obtained the named officer's body-worn camera (BWC) footage which confirmed that the named officer did not investigate the incident and served as a back-up officer standing, in large part, outside the residence.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/04/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025      PAGE# 4 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to make an arrest.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that she asked the named officer to press charges against her ex-partner, but the named officer refused.

The named officer stated that neither party asked to press charges against the other and that the complainant was primarily concerned with retrieving her belongings. The named officer did not believe that a crime occurred, but did generate an incident report reflecting the occurrence at the complainant's request.

Body-worn camera footage showed that when the officers first responded, the named officer explained to them that if domestic violence had occurred, he would be required to arrest one of them, and the complainant confirmed that is what she wanted. However, after that statement, the named officer conducted a lengthy investigation and confirmed with the complainant, several times, that her objective on said date was to retrieve her property and nothing else. Additionally, though there was some physical contact against the complainant, the officer determined that the partner acted in self defense. That determination was in his discretion to make and was consistent with both parties' statements.

Thus, because the officer did not believe a crime occurred and the complainant thereafter confirmed she just wanted her property back, the officer was within his discretion to not arrest her partner.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/04/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025**

**PAGE# 5 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant complained of the named officer's overall behavior towards her and specifically believed it was improper for him to remove her from the unit and have her stand in the hallway.

The named officer denied acting inappropriately towards her in any way. He did, however, state that he believed she felt ignored by him after he was unable to retrieve her jewelry. He informed her that she would have to handle the remainder of the situation civilly and that he did everything he could legally do within the scope of his authority. The complainant, he stated, refused to accept that.

Additionally, the named officer stated that the complainant would not let him speak or explain himself, continued to cut him off, and that he made certain comments to her because he wanted her to know how difficult it was to communicate with her. Moreover, the named officer asked her to step outside the unit as he wanted to speak to them separately and obtain independent statements.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer trying to aide the complainant in the retrieval of her property. As mentioned by the named officer, the footage showed him trying to explain the scope of his authority, but the complainant was visibly upset, and did, in fact, cut him off several times. The named officer, after pleading with her to stop cutting him off and doing his best to de-escalate the situation, appeared to become irritated with her and made comments such as, cutting him off showed him what type of person she was trying to help the complainant and attempt to explain to her what he could and could not do as an officer.

While DPA recommends officers to remain calm and professional even in light of otherwise difficult subjects, the named officer was on-scene for a substantial amount of time trying to aid the complainant and de-escalate the situation and, in these circumstances, his comments did not rise to the level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/04/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025      PAGE# 6 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer knowingly engaged in bias policing.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant believed the officers alleged misconduct towards her was due to her ethnicity.

The named officer denied knowingly engaging in bias policing towards the complainant, in any way. The named officer reiterated all the steps he took while on-scene to aide in de-escalating and resolving the situation between the two parties.

The evidence obtained does not reflect that the named officer knowingly engaged in bias policing. While the footage did reflect that the named officer was able to establish a more effective line of communication with the ex-partner, the footage did not reflect the named officer engaging in bias or unfair policing as he spent ample amount of time trying to communicate with the complainant and aide in her the retrieval of her property.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25 PAGE# 1 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant encountered the named officer on a sidewalk. The complainant said they spoke, and the named officer was aggressive and hostile during the interaction. He stated that the named officer suggested that they fight, offered to set up a boxing match between them, called him a gangster, used profane language, and attempted to provoke him to fight. A community member, whom the officer was familiar with, later approached him in a threatening manner. The complainant alleged the named officer escalated the incident, leading to the complainant being attacked by a person who arrived in the area whom the named officer identified as his son.

The named officer stated that the complainant berated and belittled him during the interaction. He said he acted with an even temperament and never called the complainant any names. He said he knows boxing promoters and offered the complainant a boxing match with him because the complainant has problems, hates cops, and needs to work off rage. He said “gangster versus cop” referring to a possible advertisement for the proposed boxing match. He said “If you see a bitch, slap a bitch” to the complainant as the complainant called him a bitch. He said if you have the nerve to say that to someone then slap them, explaining that is how he grew up. The officer said the complainant challenged his “manhood” and he told the complainant to see him when he was off duty so the complainant could beat him up.

He did not stop engaging with the complainant earlier because his vehicle wasn’t operable, and he couldn’t leave. He questioned how he was supposed to ignore the complainant, and said the complainant would have followed him if he had walked away. He denied escalating the situation and said he de-escalated with hand gestures, by treating the complainant with respect and his inaction was also de-escalation. He stated that after he saw his son try to push or punch the complainant, he created space.

The complainant submitted video footage of the incident. The footage showed the named officer and the complainant interacting and the officer initially telling the complainant to leave him alone, using profanity at one point. The named officer told the complainant that he could call a boxing promoter to set up a fight for them and mentioned “gangster versus cop” when referencing the fight. He told the complainant to see him when he was off duty. The complainant called the officer a bitch and the officer repeatedly told the complainant to “slap a bitch,” at one point shouting aggressively and repeatedly saying, “If you see a bitch slap them.” The named officer shouted at times appearing agitated. The named officer called the

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25 PAGE# 2 of 6**

complainant and his friend a “sucker” and told them that he knew what he was going to do to them if they got in the boxing ring. A community member, whom the officer was familiar with, arrived and faced off with the complainant while the officer stood by. The complainant called the officer a “rat” and the named officer later repeatedly yelled, “Kill this rat!” to the complainant. Shortly thereafter, the officer’s son threw a punch at the complainant.

Department General Order 2.01 General Rules of Conduct states in part that “Members/employees shall conduct themselves, both on and off-duty, in a manner that reflects favorably on the Department.” It states that “Honesty, credibility, even temperament, and sound judgment are essential to the performance of a member’s duties.” It also states that members shall be professional, respectful, and courteous towards others at all times. and directs members to “Treat the public with courtesy and respect and not direct discourteous or profane language at members of the public.”

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to activate a body-worn camera as required.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said he repeatedly told the named officer to turn on his body-worn camera during their interaction and the officer failed to do so.

Body-worn camera (BWC) footage for the incident showed that the named officer activated his BWC approximately twelve minutes after the interaction with the complainant began. The footage showed that the complainant asked the named officer multiple times if his BWC was on and asked him to turn it on. The footage showed an unfriendly and hostile encounter with the complainant from the start of the interaction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25 PAGE# 3 of 6**

The named officer said the complainant was hostile from the start of the interaction. The named officer said he didn't activate his BWC earlier because he did not think he needed to, thought the complainant would go away and did not know the incident was going to last as long as it did.

Department General Order 10.11 Body Worn Cameras and Department Bulletin 23-045 Activation of Body Worn Cameras both state in part that members shall activate their BWC equipment during any encounter with a member of the public that becomes hostile. The encounter was hostile for approximately 10 minutes before the officer activated his camera.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #3:** The officer failed to provide his or her name or star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said he asked the named officer for his name and badge number numerous times and the named officer ignored his request and did not respond.

Footage submitted by the complainant showed that he asked the named officer for his name and badge number numerous times and the named officer did not respond to the request.

The named officer said he is trained to provide his name and star number when requested either verbally or with a business card. He could not recall if the complainant asked him for his name and star number. After reviewing the footage where the complainant asked him for his name and star number and he did not respond, the named officer said he was being bullied by the complainant and was in the middle of expressing himself when the request was made.

Department General Order 2.01 General Rules of Conduct states in part that when requested members shall promptly and politely provide their name and star number. A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25 PAGE# 4 of 6**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that a person whom the named officer identified as his son slapped his phone out of his hand and punched him in the face in front of the named officer resulting in him getting a swollen lip. He said he could speculate what the named officer should have done in that situation based on what department policy dictates. He said the named officer instead focused his attention on him after he was the victim of the attack and had not fought back.

The named officer said his son arrived at the scene as he happened to be driving by and decided to check on his father. The named officer was standing next to his son and saw the complainant's phone fly out of his hand and saw his son either push or punch the complainant but was not sure if his son made contact. He helped create space after. He did not notify dispatch of what he witnessed because he did not know what happened and said it was a bad situation. He said he didn't see a crime occur.

Footage of the incident showed that the named officer was standing next to his son, facing the complainant and his son slapped the complainant's phone out of his hand and punched the complainant with a closed fist towards his head area. The named officer grabbed onto his son immediately after the punch was thrown and attempted to separate him from the complainant. The officer's brother and a friend were both present at the scene as well.

Body-worn camera footage showed that after the punch was thrown the named officer asked dispatch for another unit and stood by until the complainant left. The complainant and the officer's son exchanged words and then the complainant left the area. The named officer later advised dispatch that he was "code 4" meaning the situation was under control and no assistance was required after the complainant and his friend walked away from the area.

The named officer authored an incident report and documented that after reviewing his body-worn camera footage he noticed that a community member knocked the complainant's phone out of his hand and pushed away from the complainant.

The officer did not immediately notify a supervisor that he was involved in the same incident as a family member, nor did he document his family members' names or his connection to them in his incident report.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25 PAGE# 5 of 6**

California Penal Code section 240 states that “An assault is an unlawful attempt, coupled with a present ability, to commit a violent injury on the person of another.”

Department General Order 2.01 General Rules of Conduct states in part regarding conflict of interest in investigations that “If a member is assigned to an investigation in which the member knows, suspects, or should reasonably know or suspect, that the member has a personal or family interest, the member shall immediately report the interest to the member’s immediate supervisor.”

The evidence showed that an assault occurred in the named officer’s presence. He failed to investigate, did not ask the complainant if he was hit or injured, and did not notify a supervisor regarding what transpired as his family member was involved.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IC/S**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) found that the named officer prepared an incomplete and inaccurate incident report for this incident. The incident report does not accurately and thoroughly reflect the details and events of the incident.

The named officer said that preparing factual and thorough incident reports is an important duty of police officers but this changes when someone bullies you to the degree he was bullied in this incident as it makes it hard to detail and articulate exactly what occurred. He said he is sure he documented the points he needed to. He said writing the report was a difficult task under the circumstances, but that he would not make any changes to it. He said that he felt bullied and berated, which made it difficult to articulate what happened. He said it was a complete and accurate representation of what occurred.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 06/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25 PAGE# 6 of 6**

The incident report failed to document that the named officer's brother, son, and friend were the community members involved in this incident and did not thoroughly discuss their involvement. The report failed to document that, by watching BWC, the named officer determined that his son hit the complainant's phone out of his hand. The report did not document that his son pushed or threw a punch at the complainant as the officer described in his DPA interview. The report did not document that the officer's brother and friend witnessed the incident. He instead noted that when he reviewed his BWC footage at a later time he noticed that a community member knocked the complainant's phone out of his hand and pushed away from the complainant.

Department Notice 23-102 Report Writing Responsibilities states in part that preparing factual and thorough incident reports is one of the most important duties of police officers. It states that officers are responsible for preparing incident reports that are complete and accurate when memorializing an incident.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred and that the conduct violated Department policy or procedure

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: Referral/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3rd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/30/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25      PAGE # 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1: The officer engaged in retaliatory behavior.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer filed a complaint against him at his place of employment in retaliation for the complainant first filing a complaint against the officer. The complainant further alleged that he was removed from his work assignment as a result of the officer's complaint even though the investigation determined that the allegation against complainant was unfounded.

The officer denied filing a complaint against the complainant with the complainant's employer.

Department records showed that the officer wrote a memorandum to a superior officer detailing the officer's relationship with the complainant.

The DPA contacted the complainant's employer. The employer neither confirmed nor denied that the officer filed a complaint against the complainant.

The complainant did not provide evidence to support his allegation that the officer filed the complaint against him at his place of employment.

The DPA investigated this matter and uncovered no evidence suggesting that the named officer engaged in any retaliatory behavior. The officer acted within his rights by raising a conflict-of-interest issue arising from a personal matter to his supervisor's attention. Ultimately, it is the supervisor's discretion to determine the appropriate course of action in response to that information.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence standard, the alleged conduct did not occur, and DPA concluded that the allegation is unfounded.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2: The officer misrepresented the truth.**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 07/30/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25      PAGE # 2 of 2**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant expressed concern regarding the named officer's perceived favoritism toward the complainant's former romantic partner. He alleged that the named officer deliberately misrepresented the ownership of a firearm in an incident report, stating that he, the complainant, owned it, when in truth, the firearm was registered to complainant's former partner. At trial, the named officer recognized this mistake during cross-examination.

The DPA reviewed the incident report, other police records, and court transcripts. Notably, the named officer never stated in the incident report that the complainant owned the firearm. Rather, the named officer accurately memorialized that a firearm was accessible to the complainant. The named officer expressed regret in court for failing to document the firearm's true owner. Notably, the complainant suffered no adverse consequences from this mistake as police records documented the fact that the complainant's former partner confirmed that the complainant had not made any threats against her or their child though he had access to the firearm.

Based on the totality of the circumstance, there is no evidence indicating that the officer deliberately misrepresented the truth in the incident report. The officer's failure to document the registered owner of the firearm has little materiality under the totality of the circumstances given that the important issue was not who owned the firearm, but whether the complainant had access to the firearm, which he did. The relevant issue in determining the level of threat, if any, the complainant posed to his former partner did not turn on who owned the gun but on whether the complainant had access to a firearm. The named officer accurately reported that the complainant did.

Based on the preponderance of the evidence, the conduct alleged did not occur and the allegation is unfounded.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25 PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer detained a person without reasonable suspicion.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that although he was attacked by a group and acted in self-defense, the officer wrongfully treated him as a suspect and detained him.

The officer denied the allegation stating he observed the complainant, and another male engaged in a physical altercation. The officer stated that he observed the complainant raise his fist toward the unknown male, prompting a retaliatory punch that was missed. Upon approach, the unknown male complied with orders to disperse, while the complainant remained in the street, yelling aggressively. No assaults were witnessed, and the complainant did not report being attacked before the officer arrived. The officer stated that the complainant displayed signs of intoxication and persisted in his belligerent behavior despite multiple warnings. The officer determined the complainant was too intoxicated to care for himself, posed a risk to public order, and was subsequently detained.

The officer's body-worn camera showed the complainant fighting with an unknown male. Officers responded to break up the fight; however, the complainant continued to ignore the officers' order to leave. The complainant appeared to be intoxicated as he was slurring his words and was unsteady on his feet. The complainant argued with officers and got into a fighting stance with one of them.

Department records confirm that the complainant was detained for public intoxication, transported to a hospital for treatment, and subsequently released.

Department General Order 5.03 (D) states that reasonable suspicion is a set of specific facts that would lead a reasonable person to believe that a crime is, was, or is about to occur and the person under suspicion is reasonably connected to the crime. Reasonable suspicion to detain is established whenever there is any violation of law.

California Penal Code 647(f) states that every person who is found in a public place under the influence of intoxicating liquor, a drug, controlled substance, toluene, or a combination of an intoxicating liquor, drug, controlled substance, or toluene, in a condition that they are unable to exercise care for their own safety or the safety of others, or by reason of being under the influence of intoxicating liquor, drug, controlled substance, toluene, or a combination of an intoxicating liquor, drug, or toluene, interferes with or has committed the act of disorderly conduct.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/01/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25 PAGE# 2 of 2**

The officer's body-worn camera footage confirmed the officer had reasonable suspicion to detain the complainant for public intoxication.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to comply with Department General Order 5.01.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that while handcuffed and being escorted to the holding area, the officer pushed him against a wall, causing him to hit his head.

The officer denied throwing the complainant against the wall, stating that he used force that did not cause pain or injury to detain the complainant. However, the officer stated that the complainant made a complaint of pain due to his being assaulted earlier, leading to the complainant being transported to a hospital for evaluation.

Witness officers reported that they observed no force by the officer other than a control hold used to escort the complainant into the station.

The officer's body-worn camera does not show the officer intentionally throwing or pushing the complainant into the wall; however, the complainant appeared to brush against the door frame as he was escorted to the holding area. The complainant was looking back at the officer, while the officer was moving him forward.

Department General Order 5.01.04 (A) which states in part, that force may be used by an officer to carry out lawful arrests, detentions, or searches; to overcome resistance or prevent escape; and to stop the commission of public offenses.

The district station surveillance footage confirms the officer did not throw the complainant into the wall.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur or that the accused officer was not involved.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/18/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was involved in a physical altercation with restaurant staff. The complainant stated that the named officer refused to take any action against the staff person who he claimed had assaulted him.

The named officer stated that the other party did not want to press charges against the complainant. The named officer stated other officers spoke to the complainant and he also did not want to press charges. Based on what the named officer had been told and lack of other evidence, the named officer concluded that the complainant had been trespassing and was removed from the restaurant, which then led to a physical altercation outside the restaurant. The named officer concluded that neither party wanted to press charges, so no further action was taken.

SFPD documents showed that officers responded to a report of a fight. Officers spoke to all parties involved and tried to view surveillance footage, but the video system did not work. The officers concluded that no further action would be taken. The documents noted that the complainant was uncooperative and refused to talk to an interpreter.

Body-worn camera footage showed the named officer responded to the scene and spoke with a restaurant staffer who stated that the complainant was not allowed back and that they did not want to press charges. The named officer then tries to view surveillance footage but is unable to as the screen keeps freezing. The named officer then attempts to speak to the complainant. The complainant is uncooperative and does not answer the officer's questions. The named officer utilizes an interpreter to communicate with the complainant but after only a few minutes the complainant refuses to talk to the interpreter.

The named officer spoke to all parties involved and followed department investigation processes. The complainant was uncooperative and did not express a request for the restaurant staff to be arrested.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/29/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer misrepresented the truth.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant alleged that the named officer falsified a lab report, because the complainant was arrested for a car crash with which he never had any involvement.

Department records indicated that the named officer was assigned to investigate a hit-and-run crash that caused extensive damage to a utility pole and private property.

During his investigation, the named officer learned of witnesses to the crash who had seen a man matching the complainant's description, and wearing a distinctive hat, running from the scene. One witness stated that the subject's hat fell off his head when he was running. The witness retrieved the subject's hat and placed it on the crashed vehicle. The named officer submitted the hat and other items from the vehicle for DNA testing, which resulted in the identification of the complainant as a suspect. The named officer further showed photos of the complainant to a witness who saw the man running from the scene of the crash and the witness identified the complainant as that man.

Department records of the named officer's investigation showed that, during his investigation, he received a Report of Laboratory Examination from the SFPD Crime Laboratory. Among the DNA profiles that were obtained from the tested items, the officer identified the complainant as being that of the suspect who had been driving the car in the hit/run crash.

The named officer provided a Statement of Probable Cause for an arrest warrant, which was granted by a judge.

The evidence showed that the named officer conducted a thorough investigation and named the complainant as the suspect in the crash through legitimate, clearly described evidence. There is no indication that any lab report was false.

The evidence proves that alleged misconduct did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer filed false charges.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/29/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer filed false charges against him of driving into a power pole and other private property in a stolen vehicle.

Department records show that the named officer relied on evidence gathered at the scene of a hit-and-run car crash, evidence developed from witnesses at the scene of the crash and DNA tests on items from the car. The named officer submitted to a judge a statement of probable cause that the evidence showed the complainant had driven a stolen car into a power pole, causing extensive damage. Based on the results of the named officer's investigation, the judge issued a warrant for the complainant's arrest.

The evidence proves that the alleged misconduct did not occur.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3rd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/30/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1:** The officer failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** ND

**FINDING:** PC

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the officer failed to investigate a hit-and-run motor vehicle collision that occurred over three years ago. The incident resulted in property damage only; there were no injuries.

DPA requested documentation from the complainant that would support the allegations. The complainant did not respond to DPA's requests for additional information.

The named officer stated that the allegation was factually untrue and baseless. The named officer said he had just been reassigned to the Traffic Collisions Investigation Unit (TCIU) a week or two prior to the incident. The complainant called the officer daily, demanding that someone do something about her case, yet she had no case number to reference. The officer spoke to the complainant and informed her that he needed a report to reference to best advise her on her situation. After several phone calls, the complainant gave him an SFPD case number.

Upon reviewing the report, he told the complainant that this type of case is generally not assigned for investigation for several reasons. First, TCIU only had five investigators for the entire city. TCIU's primary function was, and still is, investigating all fatal crashes and serious injury crashes, including Hit & Runs, CAL OSHA deaths, etc. In cases like the complainant's reports are taken, and almost all are referred to insurance companies because SFPD does not have the resources to investigate minor property damage cases. The officer spoke to the complainant numerous times and exchanged emails with the complainant. The officer explained to the complainant that it was a matter for her insurance company since her report lacked any details to investigate, and staffing did not permit it.

The complainant refused to accept that and demanded that the officer look for video evidence in her case. Nonetheless, the officer assigned a video retrieval officer to go to the scene and canvass the neighborhood. No evidence was found. The named officer stated he went above and beyond in the case. He contacted the complainant numerous times, emailed her, and ultimately assigned her case to a sergeant for investigation. This should not have been the case, but he wanted to try and help her. During the investigation, the complainant was less than truthful during interviews, made inappropriate comments, and picked two separate individuals out of a Cold Show Lineup. All these factors only weakened her case.

During their phone conversations, the complainant told him she had minimal insurance coverage on her vehicle, felt it was unfair that she would have to pay a high deductible, and wanted to use the

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/30/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 3**

investigation to avoid paying those fees. Ultimately, this was a property damage-only case, with minimal damage and no evidence. Insurance companies routinely handle these matters. The complainant refused to be satisfied with any information provided. If TCIU had been able to positively ID the suspect, an arrest would have been made and the case presented to the DA, but the case never made it that far.

DPA reviewed department records, including the Traffic Collision Report, Chronological of Investigation, and emails. The complainant could not positively identify a suspect or vehicle related to the incident. No video evidence was located, and the complainant was found to be less than truthful during the investigation.

Department Notice 20-107 reads, "It is the policy of the Department to diligently investigate crimes in order to arrest and prosecute those responsible. However, the Department must manage its resources in a reasonable, effective and efficient manner. Therefore, the Investigations Bureau Lieutenants and the Station Investigation Team (SIT) Lieutenants shall review and evaluate each incident report that falls under their investigative jurisdiction prior to assigning cases to an Investigator." The Department Notice then provides a list of factors that should be considered when assigning cases for investigation and states that the Investigations Bureau Unit or SIT Lieutenant, and their commanding officer, retains discretion to assign cases for investigation. When assigning cases for investigation, staffing levels and the following factors should be considered:

- The severity of the crime (violence during the commission of a crime is a major contributor to the severity of the crime).
- The solvability of the crime.
- The presence or lack of physical evidence.
- The presence or lack of video footage.
- The victim(s) or witness(es) willingness or reluctance to cooperate with the investigation (the lack of cooperation by a victim or witness does not automatically disqualify the case from being successfully investigated and prosecuted).
- The victim(s) or witness(es) ability to appear in court.
- Whether the case is part of a crime series.
- Other articulable reason for assignment.

The evidence showed that the named officer assigned the case for investigation even though it did not meet the criteria for assignment. A thorough and diligent investigation was conducted, and many department resources were expended. The officer correctly determined that there was no evidence to proceed with further investigation. The evidence showed that the named officer thoroughly explained why the case would not be pursued to the complainant.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/30/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 3 of 3**

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred. However, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer tried to dissuade her from pursuing a hit-and-run traffic collision investigation by making comments to her, telling her they were too busy and had more serious cases. The named officer suggested she pursue the matter through her insurance company. The complainant did not remember the dates when the conversations occurred but said she had copies of the email correspondence she had exchanged with the named officer. The complainant did not provide the requested information.

The named officer stated that the complainant had very strong feelings about her case. The officer went above and beyond to investigate her case because he wanted to try to help the complainant even when it did not meet the department's criteria for investigation.

The evidence showed that the named officer informed the complainant of the status of the investigation throughout the process. The officer's comments were appropriate and accurate, and they do not rise to a level of misconduct. The evidence also showed that the named officer thoroughly explained to the complainant why the case would not be pursued. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/30/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer told her boyfriend he did not believe his story after he was involved in a rear-end traffic collision. The complainant felt the officer was speaking down to her boyfriend. The complainant was not present when the collision occurred.

The boyfriend stated that the officer named was "unprofessional and rude." The officer was "berating" him, saying, "I don't believe you." The officer told him he was at fault for the accident.

A witness, who is the boyfriend's mother, stated she heard the named officer tell her son in the back of the ambulance, "I don't believe your version," or similar words. The officer said to her that her son was an adult and did not need to speak to her. The witness was not present when the collision occurred.

The named officer stated he does not recall making the comments or berating the boyfriend. However, he did recall telling the boyfriend that his statement did not match the physical evidence at the scene. The named officer said he told the boyfriend that based on the physical evidence, he determined the boyfriend to be the party most at fault, which is required to complete a collision report. The boyfriend had rear-ended the vehicle in front of him that was at a complete stop. The named officer described his demeanor toward the boyfriend as cordial, prompt, direct, practical, and quick.

Witness Officer #1 stated he did not hear or observe the named officer make the comments. The named officer did not behave or speak inappropriately to any parties. Witness Officer #1 described the named officer's demeanor as calm and collected.

Witness Officer #2 stated he did not hear the named officer make inappropriate comments and described the officer's demeanor as professional and calm.

Witness Officer #3 stated he arrived on the scene as a cover unit to assist in the investigation. He spoke with the other driver involved, who spoke Cantonese. The other driver told him the boyfriend rear-ended her vehicle. He shared that information with the named officer. Witness Officer #3 stated he did not hear the named officer make inappropriate comments to the boyfriend or his mother. Witness Officer #3 described the named officer's demeanor as professional.

The body-worn camera (BWC) evidence corroborated the named officer's account of the contact. The BWC showed the named officer speaking to the boyfriend in the back of the ambulance. The named

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/30/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25**

**PAGE# 2 of 4**

officer asked the boyfriend what happened. The boyfriend said he was hit from behind by another vehicle. The following conversation occurred:

Named officer: "So you're saying someone hit you from behind?"

Boyfriend: "Yeah".

Named officer: "There's an issue with that because the damage to the vehicles does not match that story."

Boyfriend: "I truly feel something hit me behind."

Named officer: "So again, I'm letting you know that your statement doesn't match, right? Because for the damage to happen to your vehicle that it has in the front there would be significant damage to the back. So where is this other car?"

Boyfriend: "He just sped off."

Named Officer: "How old are you?"

Boyfriend: "Twenty".

Named officer: "Okay, if that's your statement that's fine. You are going to be listed as the party found most at fault so you will be responsible for this collision, okay? My partner got your information."

The BWC also shows two females approaching the named officer. The first female identifies herself as the mother of the boyfriend. The other female is the complainant. The officer responds, "Okay, he's an adult alright. So, he's over the age of 18." Mother: "Yeah, definitely. I'm the primary person on the insurance."

Department policy requires officers to be courteous when interacting with members of the public. The BWC showed the named officer was calm and professional when speaking to the boyfriend and his mother. He did not berate the complainant, nor was he unprofessional or rude. The comments made by the named officer do not rise to a level of misconduct.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer issued a citation without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/30/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 3 of 4**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The boyfriend stated that the officer issued him a citation for violating CA Vehicle section 22350 (excessive speed), and he does not think he deserved the citation.

The named officer stated he issued the citation because the boyfriend violated CVC section 22350 and was the party found most at fault based on the physical evidence at the scene.

The Traffic Collision Report and evidence photographs document significant front-end damage to the boyfriend's vehicle, which means the boyfriend had to be traveling at a higher rate of speed when he collided with the vehicle in front of him that was stopped in traffic. The rear of the boyfriend's vehicle had minor preexisting damage inconsistent with a vehicle being struck from behind. The boyfriend stated he was stopped when an unidentified vehicle collided with the rear of his vehicle, and he was pushed into the vehicle in front of him. The boyfriend's vehicle was a compact sedan. The vehicle in front of him was a larger SUV with minor rear bumper damage. The other driver was stopped in the left turn lane at the time of the collision. The other driver stated she was stopped behind another vehicle when the light turned green. The vehicle in front of her did not move forward, and the boyfriend collided with the rear of her vehicle. The named officer indicated in the report that he observed no new damage to the rear of the boyfriend's vehicle. Significant front-end damage was done to the boyfriend's vehicle. The named officer thoroughly inspected the rear bumper of the boyfriend's vehicle. There was no fresh damage, and of the minor scrapes on the rear bumper, there was dirt and debris indicative of existing damage. Based on the available evidence on the scene, the boyfriend's statement did not match the physical evidence at the scene, and Vehicle #1 had no damage to the rear bumper, so it was determined that the boyfriend was at fault.

The BWC evidence corroborated the named officer's statement.

California Vehicle Code (CVC) section 22350 states, "No person shall drive a vehicle upon a highway at a speed greater than is reasonable or prudent having due regard for weather, visibility, the traffic on, and the surface and width of, the highway, and in no event at a speed which endangers the safety of persons or property."

Department General Order (DGO) 9.01 (Traffic Enforcement) and DGO 9.02 (Vehicle Crashes) require officers to determine the party at fault for the collision and issue citations accordingly.

A preponderance of evidence showed probable cause for the named officer to issue a citation for violation of CVC section 22350.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 08/30/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25**

**PAGE# 4 of 4**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3:** The officers knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**DEPT. ACTION:**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated the named officer was biased against her boyfriend because of the way he was dressed, his race (dark-skinned Latin male), and based on his age because the officer commented on her boyfriend being 17 years old when he was 20 years old.

The boyfriend stated the officer was biased towards him based on his race, his clothing (a sweater and pajama pants), and the way he was looking at him, staring at him, and making eye contact.

The witness stated she believed the named officer was biased and discriminated against her son for the reasons stated above.

The named officer denied the allegation. The officer did not recall commenting on the boyfriend being 17. The officer stated he looks at people when he talks to them. The officer said he did not know the boyfriend's race, color, ethnicity, gender, or age before interacting with him. The boyfriend's race, color, ethnicity, gender, or age did not factor in his decision to issue a traffic citation.

Witness Officers #1, #2, and #3 stated they did not observe the named officer engage in any behavior and/or comments that could be construed as biased policing or discriminatory.

The BWC evidence showed the boyfriend wore pajama bottoms and a dark-colored hooded long-sleeved sweatshirt. While obtaining the boyfriend's statement in the back of the ambulance with medics in attendance, the named officer asks the boyfriend, "How old are you?" The boyfriend replies, "Twenty." The BWC does not capture the officer commenting about the boyfriend's age as 17. The named officer was professional and direct when speaking to the boyfriend and maintained eye contact when interacting with him.

The BWC evidence shows no overt indications of bias or discrimination on the part of the named officer. The officer acted professionally and courteously toward the boyfriend.

A preponderance of the evidence proves that the act alleged in the complaint did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/11/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer called her and forced her to immediately file a police report. She stated that although she did file such a report, she did not believe it was legal or ethical for the named officer to use his authority to force this action on her.

Despite several attempts, the Department of Police Accountability was unable to interview the complainant.

The named officer denied that he demanded or forced the complainant to take any action. He stated that the complainant's husband had informed him of crimes that had been committed against the complainant as well as a possible threat to his (the husband's) safety. The named officer stated that he had a brief telephone call with the complainant during which time she sounded nervous and at a loss for what to do. He stated that he told the complainant that the best path forward was to file a report with her local police department as well as another agency. The named officer stated that the complainant agreed to the course of action. The named officer stated that the complainant's allegations necessitated timely, detailed and thorough reporting by the complainant to multiple agencies to ensure adequate safety measures were established.

There were no witnesses to the phone call between the parties and the call was not recorded.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2025    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant crossed a crosswalk at a four-way intersection. While crossing the street, the complainant saw a patrol vehicle and noticed that the driver, officer #1, was speaking on a cell phone while driving. The complainant told Officer #1, who was driving, that it was illegal to converse on a cell phone while driving. Officer #1 pulled the patrol vehicle to the side of the road. The complainant alleged that when the officers exited the car, they told the complainant the use of the cell phone was not his problem and threatened to issue him a citation for crossing against the light even though the complainant had crossed when the light was green. The complainant denied committing any traffic violations and responded by telling the officers that it was illegal to drive while using a cell phone. Officer #1 informed the complainant that they were speaking on the cell phone due to a personal emergency.

The officers denied threatening the complainant or stating that they would issue the complainant a citation for crossing against the light. The officers reported that they did not observe the complainant committing any violations whatsoever. For this reason, the officers also explained that the encounter with the complainant did not meet the criteria for activating their body-worn cameras. The officers stated that they were stopped at a stop light when they observed the complainant waving his cell phone in the air. They pulled over to see if the complainant needed assistance when the complainant proceeded to yell at them. Officer #1 confirmed that they had received an important emergency-type phone call that was personal in nature. Officer #1 confirms that the information was relayed to the complainant because he was upset at the officer's cell phone usage.

There was no body-worn camera footage that captured this incident.

The investigation revealed that no independent evidence was obtained that captured the interaction or conversation between the complainant and the officers. Although the complainant perceived the officers' statements to be threatening, the officers denied making any such statements. Based on the conflicting evidence and the fact that no negative credibility findings could be made, the evidence was insufficient to prove the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 09/17/2024    COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2025    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer drove improperly.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the named officer was talking on their cell phone while driving a patrol vehicle, which the complainant believed to be illegal. The complainant also provided a photograph as evidence, that showed the officer using their cellphone while operating the patrol vehicle. The complainant said the officer said it was an emergency regarding a personal matter.

The named officer confirmed that while on patrol they received a call regarding a personal emergency. The phone call occurred while the named officer was stopped at a traffic light. The named officer stated they observed the complainant walking in a crosswalk waving at the officer. The complainant appeared to want to get the officer's attention, so the officer pulled over to see what, if anything, the complainant needed.

The law regarding generally prohibiting the use of handheld devices while driving is found in California Vehicle Code section 23123. However, subsection (c) of 23123 creates an exception for emergency use that states as follows:

(c) This section does not apply to a person using a wireless telephone for emergency purposes, including, but not limited to, an emergency call to a law enforcement agency, health care provider, fire department, or other emergency services agency or entity.

The investigation revealed that the officer used a cell phone while operating a motor vehicle. However, the officer explained to the complainant as well as the DPA that the purpose of the phone call was due to a personal medical matter. Therefore, the emergency exception under CVC 23123(c) applied.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred, and the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/01/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer used unnecessary or excessive force.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UF**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported he was at United Nations Plaza talking with a friend when an officer suddenly grabbed the back of his sweater and pulled him.

Department of Emergency Management computer-aided dispatch (CAD) records showed that officers were assigned to the United Nations Plaza for a special detail.

The named officer stated that he was assigned to work in the United Nations Plaza to safeguard the security of other city workers who were also assigned to the area and that city workers were deployed to the United Nations Plaza to address the drug market and illegal vending of stolen property. The named officer stated it appeared that the complainant was in the area purchasing items for sale. The complainant refused to leave the area after he was asked by the city worker. In response, the officer observed the complainant lunge at the city worker. The officer confirmed that he pulled the back of the complainant's sweater to prevent the complainant from starting a physical altercation with the city worker.

DPA interviewed the city worker involved in the incident. The city worker confirmed the named officer prevented the complainant from attacking him. The city worker described the complainant as uncooperative and aggressive. The complainant yelled profanities at him after he told the complainant that he needed to leave because they needed to clear the area. The city worker stated the complainant bumped his chest as the named officer moved to grab the complainant's sweater to pull him away from the city worker's person. The city worker was thankful the officer intervened and prevented the incident from escalating.

The policy on 'Use of Force and Proper Control of a Person' is outlined in Department General Order (DGO) 5.01. The purpose of the policy is to guide an officer's decisions regarding the use and application of force to ensure such applications are used only to effect arrest or lawful detentions or to bring a situation under legitimate control and assist the Department in achieving its highest priority. More specifically, Department General Order 5.01.04.A., authorizes officer to use reasonable force in defense of others or in self-defense.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/01/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

The investigation showed that the officer's actions were predicated on the complainant's aggressive and assaultive behavior against another city worker. Although the complainant perceived the officer's actions as improper, the evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred, and the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer issued an invalid order.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported the officer improperly ordered him to move along.

The officer denied ordering the complainant to move along. The officer stated that he did not order the complainant to move along because the complainant appeared to be in the area to make a purchase. The complainant was neither selling drugs nor involved in illegal vending of stolen property and even after the physical altercation with the city worker, the complainant remained at the scene.

The city worker confirmed that he asked the complainant to leave the area and move along, but the complainant refused. Amid his refusal, the city worker stated the complainant lunged at him and bumped into his chest. The city worker confirmed that the complainant remained at the scene after the physical altercation.

The investigation showed that the officer did not issue an invalid order.

The evidence proves that the officer did not issue an improper order to move along.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/10/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was partially forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/21/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that he had been drinking at a bar when bar security allegedly attacked him. He said that security dragged him across the floor of the bar where he was eventually punched in the face. The complainant called 911 to report the battery. The complainant said that the responding officer was unprofessional and “acting against” him. The complainant was dissatisfied with the named officer because he had allegedly threatened to arrest him and put him in a drunk tank.

The officer denied the complainant’s allegation and stated he was not acting against him. The officer said he was calm and professional during the incident and that the complainant showed obvious signs of intoxication. The officer tried to explain the procedures for the preliminary investigation but was continuously interrupted by the complainant. The officer explained to the complainant and his friend that if someone is intoxicated and unable to care for themselves officers could detain and place that individual in a sobering cell. The officer stated that informing the complainant about the sobering cell was not a threat. Rather, he was simply informing the complainant of the potential consequences if he continued to be disruptive. Once the investigation concluded the complainant requested that a supervisor be contacted because he was unhappy with the officer. The officer obliged and called a supervisor to the scene who arrived shortly thereafter.

The body-worn camera footage corroborated the officer’s account. The footage showed that the named officer spoke with the complainant regarding the incident with bar security. The complainant did not listen to the officer and repeatedly interrupted the officer while the officer was talking. The officer interviewed the bar manager who disputed the complainant’s statements. The bar manager told the officer that the complainant had been disruptive and refused to leave the bar when requested by the bar manager. As a result, the bar security removed the uncooperative complainant from the bar. The bar manager further stated the complainant insulted the security guard after the security guard was removed from the bar. The complainant showed visible signs of intoxication, namely, slurred speech, difficulty keeping his eyes open while talking, and difficulty standing still. The officer asked the complainant if he was able to care for himself and the complainant did not respond. The complainant’s friend told the officer that he would care for the complainant and that they expected their sober friends to pick them up as well.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/03/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/21/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

The officer's body-worn camera showed the officer became annoyed by the complainant's behavior, but his actions did not rise to the level of misconduct. Although the officer did discuss the option of being held in a sobering cell, the explanation was as a result of the complainant's demeanor and not the officer's contempt as perceived by the complainant.

Department General Order 2.01, General Rules of Conduct, Public Courtesy states the following (DGO 2.01.8.):

8. Public Courtesy – Members/employees shall understand and follow the principles of Procedural Justice and incorporate them into their professional work environment. These principles include giving members of the community a voice (opportunity to speak), fair/impartial treatment, respect, and providing a trustworthy process.

When acting in the performance of their duties, members/employees shall:

- a. When answering the phone, identify themselves including their name, rank, unit, station, or bureau, and inquire how they may be of service.
- b. Treat the public with courtesy and respect and not direct discourteous or profane language at members of the public.
- c. Address the public using pronouns and titles of respect appropriate to the individual's gender identity as expressed by the individual.
- d. Not demean or degrade individuals referencing their race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, or socioeconomic status.
- e. When requested, the member shall promptly and politely provide their name, star number and assignment.

The complainant perceived the officer's behavior as unprofessional. The officer denied the complainant's allegation, stating he believed he complied with the department's policy. The body-worn camera footage demonstrates that the officer's behavior was reasonably courteous and professional under the totality of circumstances.

The DPA concluded that the named officer conduct was proper, appropriate, and within policy.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/21/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that on several occasions a male officer at a police district station made abhorrent comments about his spouse and daughter while the complainant was at the station to report that his spouse was stealing from him to support her drug habit. While the complainant could provide a general description of the officer's physical appearance, such as height and hair color, he was unable to recall the officer's name or star number. The complainant also could not recall the precise dates when the officer made the alleged inappropriate comments. Additionally, the complainant reported that he believed that an unknown person had implanted a tracer or tracker in his body, leading him to believe that he was constantly being monitored. He claimed that this invasive device allowed someone to overhear his private conversations.

Department records failed to identify the alleged incident.

DPA sent an Identification Poll (ID Poll) to the District Station because the complainant did not identify a specific officer or civilian involved in the incident. An ID Poll describes the incident and asks that the Captain and/or their designee to review the incident description and identify officers that were involved. The ID Poll yielded negative results.

No witnesses were identified. Because the officer could not reasonably be identified, DPA was unable to make findings in this matter.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/22/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1-2:** The officers failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer did not conduct a complete burglary investigation because she failed to view or obtain property management's video surveillance footage of the exterior of the building.

The named officer reported that she conducted a preliminary investigation of the disappearance of the complainant's documents. She stated she was not responsible for conducting a follow-up investigation and did not decide whether a follow-up was necessary. She explained that the Investigation Unit, not patrol, has specific criteria for assigning cases for further investigation and she was not involved in those decisions.

The officer's body-worn camera footage and other department records confirmed that the officer conducted a thorough preliminary investigation. The officer obtained the complainant's statement and contacted the property manager regarding the video surveillance footage for the exterior of the building but was unable to obtain the footage. Thereafter, the officer documented the location of video surveillance in the incident report and the case was forwarded to the Burglary Unit for review.

The DPA interviewed the superior officer assigned to the Investigations Unit who reported that investigators retrieve video surveillance when, and if, a case is assigned for investigation. She stated that the complainant's case was not assigned for investigation because SFPD does not have the resources to handle every case. She also stated that SFPD Department Notice 20-107 provides a guideline for SFPD to follow when deciding whether cases for further investigation. SFPD takes into consideration the severity of the crime, the solvability, and the presence or lack of evidence. The superior office concluded that the complainant's case did not meet the criteria for assignment.

The evidence showed that the officer conducted a thorough investigation of the incident and that the evidence she uncovered on scene was insufficient to prove her home was burglarized. The named officer correctly noted that there was no surveillance footage that would have captured the alleged breaking and entering because the surveillance footage only captured the exterior of the building.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/22/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25   PAGE# 2 of 2**

The evidence prove that the named officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 10/22/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant filed an online complaint expressing confusion about why an officer wrote an incident report for a situation she reported, stating that the incident was never investigated. She also reported that she was a victim of human trafficking and felt that the San Francisco Police Department was not providing her with assistance. Additionally, she mentioned that she felt that the officers discriminated against her and her daughter.

The complainant declined to provide a statement to the Department of Police Accountability to clarify her complaint.

The incident report documented that the complainant was assaulted after she insulted unknown individuals on the street by calling them pedophiles and challenging them to act. One of these individuals punched her, and when she dropped her bag, another unknown person picked it up and left with it. Although she had visible injuries, the complainant refused medical attention. The report indicated that officers took a photograph of her and provided follow-up forms. Officers also spoke with a witness who confirmed that the complainant had called the individuals on the street pedophiles, but the witness did not see the fight itself.

Body-worn camera footage corroborated the information documented in the incident report.

Other department records showed that the case was not assigned for follow-up, and there was no associated Chronological of Investigation Report.

Department Notice 20-107 provides that the Department must “manage its resources in a reasonable, effective and efficient manner” and, as such, the Investigations Bureau Lieutenants and the Station Investigation Team Lieutenants shall review and evaluate incident reports and consider staffing levels and other factors in determining whether to assign cases to Investigators. Cases that are not assigned are administratively filed as open/inactive and may be activated when new information is presented.

The evidence proves that the SFPD’s conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/07/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that when his caretaker/physician denied him medication, he was advised by Adult Protective Services (APS) to contact the police to file a report of elder abuse. However, when the officer responded to take the report, the officer allegedly dismissed the complainant's plea and refused to prepare a report.

The officer stated that the complainant was unable to clearly articulate any specific details or circumstances that would suggest he was a victim of elder abuse. The officer stated that he attempted to contact the complainant's Adult Protective Services (APS) worker. However, he was unable to reach the case worker by telephone. The officer confirmed he did not write an incident report but did provide the complainant with a Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) number.

The officer's body-worn camera captured most of the investigation. However, the footage did not capture the officer's call to the APS worker.

The Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) confirmed that the complainant reported being a victim of Penal Code 368 because he was not assigned a Primary Care Physician (PCP), and as a result, he did not receive his medication. The officer noted in the CAD that the complainant could not provide evidence of elder abuse. However, the complainant requested a CAD number and asked the officer to contact his Adult Protective Services (APS) caseworker.

The DPA attempted to contact the complainant's APS case worker, with negative results.

Department Notice 23-110, Reporting and Investigating Suspected Elder and Dependent Adult Abuse, states that California Penal Code section 368 makes abuse against elders, dependent adults, and person with disabilities a crime. This abuse can be physical or emotional abuse, neglect, abandonment, abduction, isolation, financial exploitation, or other treatment resulting in harm, pain, mental suffering of an elder or dependent adult. Law enforcement agencies are required to investigate every report of elder abuse or disability victimizations and shall not dismiss reports for any reason without an investigation.

There was insufficient evidence to prove or disprove if the officer called the APS worker to verify the complainant's statement. Although he did not prepare a formal incident report, the officer took steps to

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/07/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25    PAGE# 2 of 2**

document the interaction by providing the complainant with a CAD number. This number is an official reference for their contact, ensuring a record of the complainant's concerns and the officer's response, despite the lack of additional evidence or a report.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/07/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/11/25      PAGE # 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported visiting a district police station to file a report about men stalking him. He said he was invited to one person's home and suspected that the people present attempted to overdose him on drugs. The complainant alleged that the men at the home recorded and streamed a sexual encounter without his consent. They admitted to finding him online for this purpose. The complainant further alleged that the named officer advised the complainant against seeking men on social media, stating, "Every time you go online, you never know who it is," while smiling. The complainant felt the officer's comments were inappropriate and that he was being victim blamed.

The Department of Police Accountability questioned the officer who denied making the alleged comment as reported by the complainant. There was no body-worn camera footage for this incident as the officer who took the report was a station keeper who is not required to wear body-worn cameras.

Due to the lack of independent evidence, the DPA concluded that the evidence was insufficient to prove the allegation.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer informed him it was not a crime to record videos in your own home or to share those videos with others. As a result, the complainant's report was not classified as a crime, and no investigation was conducted. The complainant hoped there would be an investigation, that the individuals involved would be questioned, and that the video would be retrieved to prevent further sharing.

The officer reported that the circumstances specific to the incident described to him by the complainant did not constitute a crime. The complainant presented no evidence to the officer supporting his statement

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/07/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/11/25      PAGE # 2 of 3**

that he had been videotaped. The complainant informed the officer that no sexual assault occurred, that he was never drugged, and that he went to the subject's house with the intent to engage in a sexual encounter. However, there were additional people present at the location and no consensual or non-consensual sexual activity occurred between the subjects. Thus, no crimes were committed. The officer stated he was unable to develop any cause to determine that a crime occurred involving a person being recorded inside a residence without their consent.

California Penal Code section 646.9 (a) states that any person who willfully, maliciously, and repeatedly follows or willfully and maliciously harasses another person and who makes a credible threat with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear for their safety, or the safety of their immediate family, is guilty of the crime of stalking.

California Penal Code section 646(j)(4) (A) (i) states that a person who intentionally distributes or causes to be distributed the image of the intimate body part or parts of another identifiable person, or an image of the person depicted engaged in an act of sexual intercourse, sodomy, oral copulation, sexual penetration, or an image of masturbation by the person depicted or in which the person depicted participates, when subclauses (I) to (III), inclusive, are all true:

(I) The person distributing the image knows or should know that the distribution of the image will cause serious emotional distress.

(II) The person depicted suffers serious emotional distress.

(III) One of the following has occurred:

(ia) The person depicted in the image and the person distributing the image had agreed or had an understanding that the image shall remain private.

(ib) The image was knowingly recorded, captured, or otherwise obtained by the person distributing the image without the authorization of the person depicted, and the image was recorded or captured under circumstances in which the person depicted had a reasonable expectation of privacy.

(ic) The image is knowingly obtained by the person distributing the image by exceeding authorized access from the property, accounts, messages, files, or resources of the person depicted.

The officer's statement regarding what the complainant told him was corroborated by the complainant's DPA interview. Thus, the DPA's investigation confirmed that the case was not assigned for further investigation and was classified as a suspicious occurrence rather than a crime, because the evidence the

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/07/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/11/25      PAGE # 3 of 3**

complainant provided was insufficient to demonstrate that criminal activity occurred. The officer's actions were in accordance with department policy and the law.

The evidence proves that the officer's conduct was proper under the totality of the circumstances.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25      PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** CUO

**FINDING:** NF

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that he was a victim of cyberattacks targeting his email and other devices. He visited two district police stations to report the cyberattacks and that his vehicle's license plate number had been switched. He expressed concern that the cyberattacks were attempts to steal his vehicle and identity, or to restrict his movement. The complainant felt that the officer who assisted him was unprofessional and careless. He stated that the officer dismissed his report, claiming it could not be investigated due to a mix-up with the car registration, and advised him to go to the DMV.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to the police station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Commanding Officer review the incident description and identify officers that were involved. The ID poll came back with negative results. There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

There were no witnesses at the time of the incident.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 2:** The officer failed to write an incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** ND

**FINDING:** NF

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25      PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer dismissed the report, stating it could not be investigated.

Since the complainant could not identify the specific officers involved in the interaction, DPA sent an ID Poll to the police station. An ID poll describes the incident and asks that the Commanding Officer review the incident description and identify officers that were involved. The ID poll came back with negative results. There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

There were no witnesses at the time of the incident.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2025    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-4:** The officers displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant observed numerous officers crowding a nearby sidewalk. One of the officers stepped back on his dog prompting him to tell the officer to watch his steps. The complainant said the officer apologized, but one of the officers cursed at him. He said that the officers ganged up on him, threatened him, and used expletive words. He recalled one of them, Named Officer #1, said that he was talking in such a manner because the officers were in uniform and would not do anything to him. He recalled the officer said that he should not speak in such a manner, or he would get hit in the face.

Named Officer #1 stated that he and the other named officers were attending a memorial service and were waiting for it to start when a witness officer stepped back and inadvertently walked into the complainant's dog on the sidewalk. Named Officer #1 said the witness officer apologized to the complainant, but the latter asked for star numbers and said that one of them cursed at him. Named Officer #1 said he told the complainant that no one cursed at him. He said the complainant made comments about them standing around doing nothing. He replied that they were waiting for the memorial service to start. Named Officer #1 said he never got angry at the complainant nor used threatening or expletive words. He said that no one ganged up or harassed the complainant. He denied that he threatened to hit the complainant. He, however, recalled telling the complainant that he insulted them, knowing that they would not insult him back or say anything because they were on duty and in uniform. He recalled the complainant saying they were nothing without badges, vests, and firearms and challenged him to a fight, which he completely ignored.

Named Officer #2 stated that he had never spoken with the complainant. He said he never got angry, threatened, or cursed at the complainant and could not recall the other officers' interaction.

Named Officer #3 stated that he could not recall the specifics of what he said during his brief interaction with the complainant. He said he never got angry or threatened the complainant. He said no one ganged up or used expletive words and did not hear what Named Officer #1 had said.

Named Officer #4 said he could not recall talking to the complainant or the incident itself.

The named officers stated there were no body-worn camera (BWC) videos of the incident. They said they did not have their BWCs that day because they were wearing a Class A uniform.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/13/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2025      PAGE# 2 of 2**

A witness officer stated that no one ganged up, harassed, berated, threatened, or cursed at the complainant.

There was no record or report of the incident.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #5:** The officer failed to properly supervise.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant said that as the event unfolded, the named officer failed to mitigate, stop, or de-escalate the situation, allowing other officers to threaten, berate, and curse him.

The named officer said no one ganged up, harassed, berated, threatened, or cursed at the complainant.

Two witness officers stated that the named officer de-escalated the situation by advising them to stop talking and walk away from the complainant, to which they complied.

There was no record or report of the incident.

The evidence fails to prove or disprove that the alleged conduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/20/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer inappropriately accused her of racial profiling when she was making a vehicle burglary report.

The named officer stated that although the complainant did not observe the vehicle burglary and had no video evidence or witnesses to the incident, she told the named officer that she believed “a black guy” had committed the burglary. The named officer stated he attempted to clarify the complainant’s comment and confirmed that the complainant did not have any information or evidence suggesting the race or identity of the suspect. The named officer told the complainant that by suggesting that the suspect was a specific race without any evidence, the complainant was making the named officer racially profile a person. The named officer stated he had an obligation to address the complainant’s comment and a duty to confront intolerance and to protect all citizens against prejudice-based accusations.

The named officer’s body-worn camera (BWC) footage was consistent with the statement he provided to DPA.

Department records indicated that the named officer wrote a report for the vehicle burglary, which stated that there was no video evidence or witnesses to the incident and listed the suspect as “Unknown.”

Department General Order 5.17, “Bias-Free Policing Policy,” defines racial and identity profiling and states that “bias by proxy occurs when individuals call the police and make false or ill-informed claims of misconduct about persons they dislike or are biased against based on explicit racial and identity profiling or implicit bias.” Further, “when the police act on a request for service rooted in implicit or explicit bias, they risk perpetuating the caller’s bias.”

Department General Order 6.13, “Prejudice-Based Incidents,” states that the Department will, “take a proactive role to protect all citizens against prejudice-based conduct.”

Evidence showed that the named officer appropriately addressed the complainant’s comment. He proactively educated a crime victim about racial profiling. The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 11/20/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/2025**

**PAGE# 2 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The officer displayed threatening, intimidating, or harassing behavior.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officer harassed her at work by telling her supervisor that she had racially profiled and by mentioning it again when he responded to her work on a later date.

The named officer stated that he informed the complainant's supervisor about the complainant's race-based accusation because the complainant was at work when the vehicle burglary occurred and was representing her place of work when she made the report. The named officer hoped that by speaking to the complainant's supervisor, he could convey the importance of accurate, fact-based reporting and raise awareness of the consequences of racial profiling. The named officer said that when he responded to the complainant's work on a later date, he did not mention the race-based comment again. The named officer stated that on that occasion, he shook the complainant's hand and congratulated the complainant and her co-workers for witnessing and reporting a problem. The named officer denied harassing the complainant.

The named officers' body-worn camera (BWC) footage was consistent with the statement he provided to DPA.

Department General Order 6.13, "Prejudice-Based Incidents," states that the Department will, "take a proactive role to protect all citizens against prejudice-based conduct."

Evidence showed that the named officer appropriately addressed the complainant's comment with her supervisor and did not harass the complainant.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/03/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-3:** The officers made an arrest without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that plainclothes officers arrested him outside his house for missing a court date. The complainant believed he was being harassed and that his rights were violated.

The police and court records revealed that the complainant had an outstanding bench (arrest) warrant for failing to appear in court as ordered. The incident report showed that before arresting the complainant, the officers confirmed the legitimacy of the warrant, ensuring that the arrest was both necessary and justified.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred, and the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #4:** The officer failed to properly care for, process, or book property

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that after he was arrested, an officer walked over to his neighbor's vehicle, opened the trunk without using keys, removed a brown paper bag and placed complainant's possessions into the bag. The complainant thought the officers' behavior was unusual and not a sanctioned police procedure.

The officer's body-worn camera footage contradicts the complainant's statement. The footage shows that after the complainant was arrested, the named officer retrieved a property bag from an unmarked police vehicle and collected the complainant's personal property for processing.

The evidence proves by a preponderance that the conduct alleged did not occur and that the allegation is unfounded.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/3/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 1 of 3**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was engaged in an ongoing dispute with her property manager, which has led her to obtain a temporary restraining order against them. In her attempts to retrieve personal belongings from a shared storage unit at her residence, she contacted a superior officer at the police district station thirteen times by phone and visited nine times in person.

She expressed frustration with the patrol officers who investigated a violation of the restraining order, believing they were incorrect in stating that the property manager had the legal right to restrict her access to the storage unit. Despite her persistent efforts, the superior officer supported the patrol officers' actions.

The Field Training Manual provides guidance for officers to handle civil disputes involving landlords and tenants. Officers are to remain impartial, preserve the peace, determine whether or not a crime was committed, conduct an investigation if a crime was committed, provide safety to individuals and property, offer names of referral agencies, and consider arrest as a viable alternative if a crime was committed. The police reports and body-worn camera footage confirmed that the patrol officers conducted a complete investigation. The body-worn camera footage and incident report showed the patrol officers reviewed all the relevant documents, obtained statements from both parties, and booked the relevant evidence. The complainant had a valid temporary restraining order (TRO) but the property manager had a lease agreement giving her sole access to the storage unit. The officers determined that no crime occurred because the property manager stayed the legal distance away from the complainant and the property manager had a legal right to restrict the complainant's access to the storage unit.

The superior officer reviewed the incident report and the body-worn camera (BWC) footage, concluding that the patrol officers handled the situation appropriately. The complainant was not permitted to access the storage unit. The DPA also reviewed the incident report and agreed with the superior and patrol officers that this matter was civil, not criminal, and should be resolved in civil court. The officers did not have the legal authority to enter the storage unit without a search warrant or an exception to the warrant requirement applied. Department General Order 5.16.02, SFPD's policy on Search Warrants states:

- A. Under the Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the California Constitution, individuals are granted protections against unreasonable searches and seizures. The Fourth Amendment states, "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/3/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 2 of 3**

upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.”

Members shall comply with all constitutional and statutory requirements when obtaining, executing, and returning search warrants.

Therefore, the officers acted appropriately in not accessing the storage unit because they did not have a warrant and no exceptions to the warrant requirement – such as consent or exigent circumstances – applied.

Although the complainant perceived the actions of the named officer as negligent, the DPA's investigation revealed that the named superior officer had diligently addressed the complainant's concerns and concluded that the patrol officers had acted in compliance with department policies and manuals. No crime had been committed, and the matter in question was ultimately determined to be civil in nature.

The evidence proves that the named officer's conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 2:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: IE**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer sent her an unprofessional email response, which she described as cruel.

DGO 2.01.03 states that as follows:

8. Public Courtesy - Members/employees shall understand and follow the principles of Procedural Justice and incorporate them into their professional work environment. These principles include giving members of the community a voice (opportunity to speak), fair/impartial treatment, respect, and providing a trustworthy process. When acting in the performance of their duties, members/employees shall:

- a) When answering the phone, identify themselves including their name, rank, unit, station, or bureau, and inquire how they may be of service.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/3/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25      PAGE# 3 of 3**

- b) Treat the public with courtesy and respect and not direct discourteous or profane language at members of the public.
- c) Address the public using pronouns and titles of respect appropriate to the individual's gender identity as expressed by the individual.
- d) Not demean or degrade individuals referencing their race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, mental or physical disability, or socioeconomic status.
- e) When requested, the member shall promptly and politely provide their name, star number and assignment.

DPA reviewed the email response that the officer sent to the complainant. The email response summarized the officer's investigation into the allegations made by the complainant about how two patrol officers handled her landlord dispute. Thus, the email confirms that the superior officer took the complainant's claims seriously. He reviewed all the evidence in the case before making a judgment and ultimately determined that the two officers followed the law and department policy. While the email response was fair, some parts could reasonably be interpreted as preachy and somewhat harsh. Nonetheless, given the overall context of the email, and the circumstances that gave rise to it, the named officers comments did not rise to the level misconduct.

The evidence was insufficient to prove that misconduct occurred.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/05/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that an officer in a department vehicle revved the engine inappropriately while the complainant was walking through a crosswalk. The complainant interpreted this action as an attempt by the driver to rush him through the crosswalk. Although the complainant could not identify the officers involved, he did provide the vehicle number.

Police records indicated that there was no record of any SFPD vehicle matching the vehicle number provided. Additionally, the complainant did not provide further details, making it impossible to investigate the allegation further or identify the officer involved in the complaint.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/29/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers failed to quiet or disperse a group of people playing loud music.

The named officers stated that they responded to the scene and observed one person, who the named officers recognized, playing loud music. The named officers activated their emergency lights and sirens to get the person's attention. The named officers told the person to lower the volume of the music, and the person complied. The named officers stated that they did not force the person to move because the person was on a public sidewalk.

Department records indicated that the named officers responded to a noise nuisance call where there were reportedly seven subjects blasting music on the sidewalk. The named officers ran a query on the name of one person and cleared the call with disposition: "Advised."

Evidence showed that the named officers responded to the call for service and took appropriate action to quiet the nuisance.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/30/24**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: M**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** By mutual agreement of the complainant and the named officer, the complaint was mediated and resolved in a non-disciplinary manner on 2/11/25.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/23/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25 PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer issued a citation without cause.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant, a rideshare driver, said he dropped a passenger off at an airport and saw an officer in a police vehicle taking photographs of rideshare cars. He later received an administrative citation issued by the named officer for failing to display visible “trade dress” on his vehicle’s rear window. The complainant said the citation was issued without cause as he had a trade dress sticker affixed on the inside of the rear window. He stated his vehicle’s back window was tinted by the factory.

The complainant submitted a photograph from his vehicle dash camera that showed an item on his rear window, presumably an Uber placard. He also submitted a digital message he received from the ride-share company he worked with regarding the citation, which said that trade dress must be visible from fifty feet and should be moved to the outside of the vehicle’s window if the windows are tinted.

The named officer said the complainant’s vehicle was in a roadway area for ride-share vehicles and there was no visible trade dress in the rear window. The officer said the vehicle’s rear window was tinted. The named officer issued the complainant’s vehicle an administrative citation for violating ground transportation regulations.

The complainant’s vehicle was issued an airport commission administrative citation for failing to have any visible rear trade dress, violating rules 4.7(A) for failure to comply with permit terms, directives, and requirements of Rule 4.7(A) and 4.7 (A)(4)(a) for lack of or improper trade dress, placard, TCP number, decal, logo. A picture of the outer rear portion of the complainant’s vehicle was included on the citation, in which the rear window appeared tinted, with no visible trade dress.

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) General Order states in part that Transportation Network Company vehicles “shall display consistent trade dress in the front and rear of the vehicle (i.e., distinctive signage or display on the vehicle) when providing TNC services that is sufficiently large and color contrasted as to be readable during daylight hours at a distance of at least 50 feet.”

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 12/23/2024**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25 PAGE# 2 of 2**

The officer demonstrated that, when the citation was issued, probable cause existed that the vehicle was violating the Airport Ground Rules for ride-share drivers.

The evidence proved that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer prepared an incomplete or inaccurate incident report.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that the officer misquoted him in the incident report, which led to the mistaken assumption that the complainant was suicidal.

The DPA reviewed the body-worn camera footage, incident report, and other police records. The body-worn camera footage revealed that the officer did not misquote the complainant in the incident report.

The evidence proves that the conduct alleged did not occur. Therefore, the allegation is unfounded.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/08/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer knowingly engaged in biased policing or discrimination.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant was parked on the side of the street and was in the process of exiting her vehicle. According to her, when she opened her door, a car traveling at an excessive speed hit her driver's side door and her arm. The complainant said the named officer and her partner arrived to investigate the incident. She said that in the course of her investigation, the named officer exhibited racially biased behavior by believing the other driver's statement and stating in her report that she was the one at fault in the collision. The complainant said the named officer exhibited such biased behavior because of her race and being angry at the scene.

The named officer denied the complainant's claims that she was biased and favored the other party. She said she conducted her investigation based on her training. She said she considered statements of both parties, and the evidence gathered at the scene in her investigation of the collision.

A witness officer stated that the named officer was professional and compassionate, carrying out her duties to the best of her abilities. The officer stated that the named officer considered all the facts before making her determination.

The incident report stated that the complainant's driver's side door hit the right front panel of the other vehicle when she opened it to exit her vehicle. After investigation, the named officer found the complainant violated section 22517 of the California Vehicle Code. The named officer determined that the complainant opened her door without due regard to whether it was safe for her to do so.

The Department of Police Accountability (DPA) obtained the incident's body worn camera (BWC) footage. The footage was consistent with the officers' statements provided to DPA. The footage showed the named officer was calm, professional, and unbiased in her investigation. She was focused on getting the facts and information from both parties and did not appear to favor or side with either of them.

The evidence prove that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/10/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The SFPD failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant purchased food items and noticed them missing from her residence within several days. She suspected her roommate stole the food but admitted she had no evidence to support her suspicion. She also noticed a vehicle with an out-of-state license plate parked outside her residence and suspected that it was involved in the theft. She filed an online incident report regarding her suspicions and said police never contacted her.

Records showed that the complainant submitted a report regarding her missing food and included the vehicle whose involvement she suspected. The complainant named potential suspects in the report and a supplemental report but provided no evidence linking them to a theft.

Records showed that the case was not assigned for further investigation.

San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) policy leaves to the discretion of the lieutenant in charge of assigning cases the decision to assign cases. Staffing levels and the presence or lack of physical evidence are some of the factors that can be considered when assigning cases. The report not being assigned for investigation is within SFPD policy.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/21/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** CUO

**FINDING:** NF/W

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/15/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/23/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/11/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-2**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters not rationally within the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/25/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

SFMTA Department of Parking and Traffic  
11 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/24/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside of the Department of Police Accountability jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside of the Department of Police Accountability jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

DEM Division of Emergency Communications  
1011 Turk Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 01/29/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/11/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/CHP Dublin Area Office (390) - IA**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

CHP Dublin Area Office (390)  
Internal Affairs Division  
4999 Gleason Drive  
Dublin, CA 94568



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/02/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/2025    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to promptly respond to a scene.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that he called the police to report vandalism to his vehicle, but officers did not respond for over nine hours.

Department records indicated that the complainant reported to Dispatch that his vehicle was vandalized and that he wanted to meet with police. Records indicated that the complainant's call for service was categorized as a priority "C" call. Records indicated that the complainant called three more times after his initial call, and the dispatcher advised the complainant of the delay each time. The named officers were dispatched approximately ten hours and 15 minutes after the complainant's initial call, and they arrived on scene approximately five minutes after they were dispatched. The named officers called the complainant and left him a voicemail, and the complainant called back approximately 15 minutes later advising that he had missed the call from police and that he would call back the next day.

The evidence indicated that the named officers responded to the scene promptly after they were dispatched. The delay occurred with DEM due to call volume and priority status.

The evidence proves that the alleged misconduct did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer inappropriately accessed a database or confidential information.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: U**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that sometime in 2023 or 2024, the named officer accessed confidential information using a police database and shared it with an unauthorized party.

Online court records indicated that the information that the complainant referenced was publicly available.

Department records indicated that the named officer retired from the San Francisco Police Department in 2022 and did not have access to police databases or files during the alleged timeframe.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct did not occur.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/03/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/DPW**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Department of Public Works  
2323 Cesar Chavez Street  
San Francisco, CA 94124

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #2:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Office of the Mayor**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

City & County of San Francisco  
Office of the Mayor  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlet Place  
City Hall Room #200  
San Francisco, CA 94012

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/11/25    PAGE# 1 of 2**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to provide his or her name or star number.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers failed to provide their names and badge numbers to her. The complainant admitted that she did not ask for the officers' names or badge numbers.

SFPD policy states: When requested, the member shall promptly and politely provide their name, star number and assignment.

The complainant did not request the names and badge numbers of the named officers. They had no obligation to provide her with these details. The complainant also stated the officers were in uniform so their names and numbers will have been displayed for her to see.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #3-4:** The officers failed to provide required information.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/03/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/11/25    PAGE# 2 of 2**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers did not provide her with a reference number related to them being at her address. The complainant stated she did not ask for this information from the named officers.

SFPD documentation showed that the named officers were dispatched to the complainant's address after another person called police to report the complainant for an alleged dispute.

The complainant was not detained or arrested. The complainant engaged in a consensual encounter with the named officers as a subject of a civil complaint. The named officers are under no obligation to provide the complainant with a reference number unprompted.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/04/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/06/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Sheriff Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
25 Van Ness Avenue Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/04/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS #1-2:** The officers failed to properly investigate.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: PC**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that the named officers failed to obtain video footage of an incident for which he was arrested. The complainant stated that, had the officers obtained the footage of the entire incident, it would have shown the moment he was attacked and would have exonerated him.

SFPD records showed the named officers obtained footage that covered the entire incident, as described by the complainant. The police report documenting the investigation by the named officers lists two separate videos of the incident; one collected on the day of the incident, and one provided by a witness the following day. The video footage captured the part of the engagement the complainant said was not depicted in evidence.

The evidence showed that the named officers did collect video footage of the incident as they are required to do.

The evidence proves that the alleged conduct occurred; however, the conduct was justified, lawful, and proper.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/04/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:** ND

**FINDING:** NF/W

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant requested a withdrawal of the complaint.



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer drove improperly.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant filed a complainant anonymously regarding an unspecified patrol car cutting through a gas station to access an adjacent street. The complainant felt that the driving maneuver was dangerous and could have caused injury.

Without further information the Department of Police Accountability was unable to identify the officer.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably identified or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that she observed an officer standing on a corner while illegal street vendors sold stolen goods on the sidewalk. At the same corner, persons rode a scooter and bicycle on the sidewalk, operating at high speeds and in an unsafe manner. The officer did not take any action or make any comments addressing this situation.

There was insufficient information to identify the officer for the DPA to conduct further investigation.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**DATE OF COMPLAINT: 2/7/2025**

**DATE OF COMPLETION: 02/11/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**      **FINDING:**      **IO-2**      **DEPT. ACTION:**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters not rationally within DPA jurisdiction.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant reported that there are frequent speed traps between the Sunset and Richmond Districts. However, he questions why police resources aren't being allocated to address more violent issues occurring in the city. He requested to speak with someone to gain a better understanding of how police resources are distributed.

The complainant did not provide sufficient information for the DPA to conduct further investigation or refer his concerns to the Office of the Chief of Police. Moreover, the complaint involved a general comment about SFPD's allocation of resources rather than police misconduct.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer who allegedly engaged in misconduct cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/08/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

SFPD Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3rd Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25   PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION # 1:** The officer failed to take required action.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant reported that he made several calls for an ambulance over a period of hours, but his requests for dispatch were denied. He also stated that officers refused to file a mandatory report regarding the abuse he experienced.

The DPA requested additional information from the complainant; however, he did not respond. As a result, there was insufficient information to identify the officer, preventing the DPA from conducting further investigation.

No finding outcomes occur when an officer cannot reasonably be identified.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/Tenderloin Task Force**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

Tenderloin Task Force  
301 Eddy Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Academy Pistol Range  
700 John Muir Drive  
San Francisco, CA 94132



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: IO/1**

**FINDING: Referral/SFSO IA**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
25 Van Ness Avenue Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25 PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/SFMTA**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
Department of Parking & Traffic  
11 South Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94103

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/20/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer behaved or spoke inappropriately.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** An anonymous complainant stated that a flag on top of a skyscraper was torn. She tried to report this to the non-emergency line. SFPD, and Public Safety. After being transferred to different departments, she received a call from SFPD. The complainant said she should not have had a call back as she made the complaint anonymously.

The complainant left no contact details to obtain further information to investigate. The officer calling the complainant back could not be identified.

No findings are made if the officer cannot reasonably be identified, or the officer has left the Department and is therefore no longer subject to discipline.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2024      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Office of Chief of Police**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Office of Chief of Police  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Office of Chief of Police**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Office of the Chief of Police  
San Francisco Police Department  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/09/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/24/25    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Office of Chief of Police**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Office of the Chief of Police  
San Francisco Police Department  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

Ingleside Police Station  
1 Sgt John V Young Lane  
San Francisco, CA 94112

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/13/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was referred in full to:

Central Police Station  
766 Vallejo Street  
San Francisco, CA 94133



**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/11/25      COMPLETION DATE: 02/25/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: UA**

**FINDING: IO-1/San Francisco Sheriff's Department**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Sheriff's Department  
25 Van Ness Avenue Suite 350  
San Francisco, CA 94102

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/20/25    COMPLETION DATE: 02/21/2025    PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer drove improperly.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: ND**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated he/she and his/her friend were crossing the street in the crosswalk when a police SUV swerved directly into their path. The complainant did not provide his/her contact information and did not provide the date of the incident.

The identify of the alleged officer could not be established.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/20/25**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/21/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The officer improperly used SFPD's Instagram account.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT: CUO**

**FINDING: NF**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** The complainant stated that an officer improperly used SFPD's official Instagram account. The complainant did not specifically identify the alleged officer and did not leave any contact information.

The identify of the alleged officer could not be established.

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/25/2025**

**COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/2025**

**PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the Department of Police Accountability's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/IAD**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

San Francisco Police Department  
Internal Affairs Division  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158

**SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF POLICE ACCOUNTABILITY  
COMPLAINT SUMMARY REPORT**

**COMPLAINT DATE: 02/06/2025      COMPLETION DATE: 02/27/25      PAGE# 1 of 1**

**SUMMARY OF ALLEGATION #1:** The complaint raises matters outside the DPA's jurisdiction.

**CATEGORY OF CONDUCT:**

**FINDING: IO-1/Office of Chief of Police**

**FINDINGS OF FACT:** This complaint raises matters outside DPA's jurisdiction. This complaint was forwarded to:

Office of the Chief of Police  
San Francisco Police Department  
1245 3<sup>rd</sup> Street  
San Francisco, CA 94158